This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Theol
7 Zk

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

61328

EDITED BY DAVID N. LORD.

VOL. XII.

JULY, 1859—APRIL, 1860.

DONATED BY THE
MERCANTILE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
NEW YORK CITY

ZEA

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN KNIGHT,
348 BROADWAY.
1860.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
21402A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1924 L

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1859, by
DAVID N. LORD,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

R. CRAIGHEAD, Printer and Stereotyper,
Caxton Building,
81, 83, and 85 Dean st., N. Y.

CONTENTS OF No. XLV.

PAGE

Art. I.—Dr. Harris's Theory of the Conversion of the World, ... 1
Art. II.—Notes on Scripture—Matthew xx.-xxii., . . 87
Art. III.—Regeneration. Its Author, its Instrument, and its Fruits and Evidences. By Rev. E. C. Wines, D.D., ... 93
Art. IV.—Exposition of Acts vi. and vii. 120
Art. V.—The Facts of Geology consistent with the Revealed History of Creation. By Rev. D. C. M'Laren, D.D., ... 133
Art. VI.—Dr. Sprague's Annals of the American Episcopal Pulpit, ... 151
Art. VII.—A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters xliv. and xlv., ... 153

CONTENTS OF No. XLVI.

Art. I.—Rev. Mr. Lee's Eschatology, ... 177
Art. II.—Notes on Scripture—Matthew xxii.-xxiii., . . 219
Art. III.—The Judgments foreshown under the Vials, . . 249
Art. IV.—The Deluge a Cause of Geological Change, . . 263
Art. V.—The Doctrine of Christ's Coming and Reign soon to be Held by the Evangelical Church Generally, ... 293
Art. VI.—A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters xlvi. xlvii. and xlviii., . . 318
Art. VII.—Literary and Critical Notices. 337
1. Dr. Wines's Commentaries on the Laws of the Hebrews, 337
2. Dr. Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual, ... 338
3. Dr. Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction, . 339
4. Dr. Breckenridge's Knowledge of God Subjectively considered, ... 339
5. Rev. Mr. Newton's Lectures on Daniel, ... 340
6. Dr. N. Adams's Great Concern, ... 341
7. Dr. Foot's Sketches of Virginia, ... 342
8. Dr. Tyler's Lectures on Theology, ... 342
9. Mrs. Ashton's Mothers of the Bible, ... 343
10. Rev. Mr. Jukes's Types of Genesis, ... 344
11. Mr. Masson's Life of John Milton, ... 349
12. Old South Chapel Prayer Meeting, ... 349
13. Sir W. Hamilton's Lectures on Metaphysics, . . 349
14. Mr. Wilson's New History of the Conquest of Mexico, . 350
15. Dr. Wines's Discourses, ... 350
16. Rev. Mr. Winthrop's Tract on Prayer, ... 351
17. The British Periodicals, ... 351

CONTENTS OF No. XLVII.

PAGE

Art. I.—Dr. Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought, . . 353
Art. II.—Notes on Scripture—Matthew xxiii.–xxvi., . . 372
Art. III.—Christ's Promises, in the Epistles to the Churches, to those who are Victorious, ... 406
Art. IV.—The Indo-Syrian Church, ... 420
Art. V.—Designation and Exposition of Isaiah, Chapters xlix. l. and li., ... 438
Art. VI.—The Book of Judges, ... 468
Art. VII.—Mr. Hequembourg's Plan of Creation, . . . 477

CONTENTS OF No. XLVIII.

Art. I.—Dr. Fairbairn's Typology, ... 529
Art. II.—God is Love. By Rev. Dr. Pond, ... 571
Art. III.—Dr. J. F. Berg's False View of the Second Advent, 589
Art. IV.—Divine Authority of the Bible in Review of Rev. A. Barnes. By Rev. H. Carleton, ... 632
Art. V.—Designation and Exposition of Isaiah, Chapters lii. and liii., ... 663
Art. VI.—Answers to Correspondents, ... 677
1. Acts of the Divine Nature in Christ . . . 677

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME XII. JULY, 1859. NUMBER I.

Art. I.—Dr. Harris's Theory of the Conversion of the World.

The Great Commission; or, the Christian Church constituted, and charged to convey the Gospel to the World. By the Rev. John Harris, D.D. Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln. 1848.

The efforts of men to recall attention to important subjects that have fallen into neglect, and give them the place in the regards of the church to which they are entitled, sometimes defeat themselves, in a measure, by the unsuitableness of the methods they employ for the purpose, serious errors which they intermix in their speculations, or exaggerations and extravagances to which they resort in their desire to give effect to their views. Dr. Harris's Treatise on the office the church is to fill in the conversion of the world, is an example of this ill-judging zeal. It was written for the prize of two hundred guineas, offered in Scotland about twenty years ago, for the best "Essay on the Duty, Privilege, and Encouragement of Christians to send the Gospel of Salvation to the unenlightened Nations of the Earth;"—and naturally ardent and imaginative, in his

eagerness to present the subject in a novel and imposing attitude, and make a strong impression on his readers, he put forth a view of it that is in a large degree the work of his fancy, and attempted to sustain it by reasonings so one-sided and fallacious, kept the most express testimonies of the word of God that relate to it so entirely out of sight, and so overwrought his delineations and appeals, that in place of winning the intelligent and impartial, they recoil from it as the work of an over-heated special pleader, rather than a calm, far-seeing, and thorough inquirer into the teachings of the divine word.

The theory on which he proceeds is that of anti-millenarianism, that the Christianization of the world and the millennium are to precede Christ's second coming; and thence that the nations are to be brought to repentance and faith through the instrumentality of the church in the use simply of the means that are now employed—the communication of the gospel—for the conversion of men. He holds, accordingly, that it is the duty of the church to make

actually presses that influence into its own service, and proposes, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, to sanctify and employ it as *the chosen instrumentality by which to expel from the earth the evils produced by its perversion;* till every man shall have become once more what he was primarily formed to be—an agent of unmingled good to every other man, and the world be restored to God. Without repealing or deranging any of the original relations or existing arrangements of nature, though they had all been perverted into means of destruction, a plan is superinduced which proposes to turn all those relations and arrangements to *the highest account as the means of recovery;* to make the chain of our mutual dependence once more fast to the throne of God."—P. 55.

The medium through which this influence is to be exerted, he represents, is the cross or work of Christ; and he exhibits that, in a large measure, as accomplishing its effect by a mere manifestation of truth. He says of the Redeemer:

"He saw that, as mind rules matter, character rules mind itself, draws other minds into sympathy with it, imparts new impulses to society, speaks with a voice heard by distant nations, and which goes down to future ages. He said, therefore, that when his character should come to be truly known—known for his unconquerable devotedness to the cause of God and man, in having borne down, by a course of unexampled self-denial, the greatest obstacles in the universe, made his way from heaven, through the ranks of hell, into the midst of the world, and direct to a cross; known for his self-sacrificing benevolence, in having effected an unbroken descent from heights of glory no wing can scale, to depths of humiliation no line can fathom; known for having presented to a world which refused to live unto God, the amazing spectacle of a God living to it, turning his whole self into a sacrifice compared with which nothing else would ever deserve the name; known for the richness of his gifts and the vastness of his design, as including the happiness, without measure, of numbers without calculation, and for ages without end—all who should experimentally know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, would be penetrated and possessed with the effect, and would compass sea and land to propagate the report."—P. 47.

This looks far too much as though the great aim of Christ was to manifest his love by his self-denial and submission

to evil, and as though his mediation accomplishes its office through the mere medium of motives.

The influence by which this knowledge of Christ is to be conveyed to mankind, he holds, is the influence of man.

"This brings us to consider the Scripture theory of Christian instrumentality for the conversion of the world. The early triumphs of the gospel demonstrated that the influence of the cross was not left to find its way through the world as it could —to operate at random. The plan which provided the influence of the cross, provided also the method of its diffusion and propagation. And on inspection we shall find that plan so simple in its principle, so connected in its parts, so comprehensive in its outline; and so well adapted in its efficiency and success, as to show that the wisdom that framed it was divine, and that nothing but *adherence to it is wanting for the conversion of the world.*

"We have already shown that by the constitution of our nature we are made to influence each other: that the perversion of that influence by sin, is the great secret of the world's continued depravity; that through the agency of the Holy Spirit the doctrine of the cross is the antagonist principle, the counter influence by which sin is to be vanquished and man restored. We may expect, therefore, that the instrumentality to be employed in the service of the cross will be *influence* also. And accordingly, *human influence*, deriving its efficacy from heaven, is the specific instrumentality by which the gospel proposes to propagate its tranforming effects."—P. 52.

And finally he founds on these postulates the chief and distinctive doctrine of his volume, that the great object of Christ in renewing individuals is to fit them to fill this office in the conversion of others, and thence that the first and most imperative duty to which the renewed are called, is the communication of the gospel to others in order to their conversion. The steps by which he reaches this conclusion are, 1. That each individual who is renewed thereby becomes Christ's and like him, and therefore must live in the world for the same purpose for which Christ came into it, namely, the salvation of the perishing. 2. That a chief object of the union of the renewed in a society, the church, is that they may combine their influence for that end; and, 3. That the first and supreme duty of the church is to exert

itself in its sphere as the instrument of converting the world. Pp. 58–63. The sentiment of this passage, too long for citation, is briefly expressed on other pages, in the following forms:

"And this reminds us that not only are we his by original right, and his by redemption, but that *the great object* for which relatively he has brought us under such obligations [to imitate his benevolence], and for which he has, in addition, formed us into a church, is *that he might engage* and ENGROSS *our instrumentality for the salvation of others.*"—P. 373.

"Having made it imperative on every individual disciple to consecrate his *entire influence, from the moment of his conversion, to the diffusion of the Gospel,* the Saviour made it equally binding on all to *unite* for the same object."—P. 87.

"Christ, as the head of the Church on earth, authoritatively requires that each individual Christian surrender himself, and live supremely for the conversion of others; that these unite into particular societies for the conversion of greater numbers still; that all these societies in every land combine in sympathy and purpose for the salvation of the entire race."—P. 111.

He devotes his Essay, accordingly, to the support of this doctrine. His theory is thus founded, not on the teachings of revelation, but on psychology, or our intelligent and social nature, and the relations to each other in which we are placed; and it is as mistaken and absurd as it is devoid of authority from the Scriptures. It surely does not follow from the fact that our nature and condition are such that we exert important influences on each other, that our first and supreme duty is due to man instead of God. It does not follow from the fact that Christ is the Saviour of men, that our chief sphere of activity and supreme aim are to be essentially the same as his. It does not follow from the mere fact that we are so formed as to be capable of exerting important influences on our fellow-men who are in sin, that we are to make their well-being our first and supreme aim; any more than from the fact that it is our duty to feed the hungry, it follows that we are bound to make that our exclusive or chief business. It is only one among many duties, some of which are often of higher and more imperative obligation. His assumption, if legitimate, would imply that the

holy angels, being capable of exerting influences on those of their own order, are under obligation to seek, above all other ends, the well-being of Satan and his legions. But instead of that, their duties in reference to Satan and his hosts are duties of resistance and counteraction. And those of our race who are renewed, while under obligation, within certain limits, to seek the conversion of the unbelieving, have also many other duties that are equally, and often more imperative, and that sometimes, instead of mercy, are duties of resistance and abandonment to destruction.

The great doctrine of his book, on which he relies to prove that the world is to be converted by human instrumentality, anterior to Christ's second coming, is thus both founded on an untheological basis and mistaken. He accordingly fails—as we shall proceed to show—to sustain it by the authority either of the Scriptures or reason.

The point to be debated is not at all, let it be considered, whether it is the duty of the church to make known the gospel, if practicable, to all nations. There is no question between us on that subject. The command of Christ to his

But the question is simply whether, as Dr. Harris maintains, it is the first and supreme duty of every individual and all who are renewed—in comparison with which all other obligations sink into insignificance—to communicate the gospel to the unevangelized; whether, as he affirms, God has promised that the proclamation of the gospel to them shall infallibly be attended with absolute success; and whether, as Dr. H. asserts, God has foreshown that the world shall thus be converted by the "influence" of men, anterior to Christ's second coming.

And, in the first place, he offers no valid proof of it. The only considerations he alleges to sustain it, are drawn either from psychology, which is no proper ground of such a doctrine respecting the divine purposes, or from passages of Scripture that present no such statement, and involve no such implication as he ascribes to them; such as the command to preach the gospel to all men, which he affirms is virtually a promise that all to whom the gospel shall be preached, shall be converted by it; and predictions that all nations shall at length be converted, which he interprets as predictions that they shall all be converted, according to his theory, by human "influence," and antecedently to Christ's second coming. But the command to the apostles and other teachers to proclaim the gospel to all nations, no more implies that all the nations to whom it is preached will be converted by it, than the command to all men everywhere to repent, and other injunctions of the divine word, imply that all who hear them, will immediately yield them obedience. Nor do mere predictions that all nations will at length come and worship before God, imply that they are all to be converted by the proclamation of the gospel to them by men before Christ's second advent, any more than they imply that their conversion will not take place till after his second coming. They leave the time and manner of their conversion to be determined wholly by other passages, which directly treat of them. And this fallacy of building demonstrations on grounds that yield his propositions no support, reigns throughout his argument.

In the next place, it implies—in the representation that the first and supreme aim of every one who is renewed should be the conversion of others—that man has a higher

title to our regard than God: For, if he has not, how can it be a duty to make him the first and chief object of interest and regard? But that is absurd and contradictory to the divine law, which requires that God should be loved with all the heart, and all the soul, and all the mind, and all the strength, and limits the love with which fellow-creatures are to be regarded to the measure of that with which each one loves himself. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Others are not to engage the chief interest of the heart, therefore, nor be the chief object of one's aims and activity. It were in effect to dethrone the Creator, and exalt fellow-creatures in his place.

In the third place, it misrepresents, in a measure, the office which man fills in the conversion of others. It is his work simply to present the truths of the gospel to his fellow-men, and there his function ends. It is not his to exert the influence by which they are made efficacious. It is the work of a higher power to open the mind to receive them, and give them an effective impression. The mere agency of the preacher or teacher never accomplishes the renova-

According to Dr. Harris, it is the duty of any one individual who is renewed, whether man or woman, young or old, as much as it is of any other. If it is the supreme duty of each, it must equally be the duty of all; and Paul was therefore, in fact, no more commissioned to preach the gospel to the nations than any other converted Jew or Gentile of that age. But what can be more at war with the teachings of the New Testament? The appointment of witnesses of Christ's life, death, and resurrection, and heralds of the glad news of salvation through his blood, was the most essential measure in the organization of the church, and the office of teaching was confided to comparatively a small number. The sphere assigned to most of those who were converted was of a wholly subordinate and less influential nature. The great bulk of the churches at Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, at Corinth, and at Rome, were not required to disperse themselves in the surrounding countries, or more distant regions, and employ themselves in preaching the gospel. They were expressly enjoined to *remain in the callings in which they were occupied at their conversion.* On Dr. Harris's theory, those churches would never have been formed; or if formed, would immediately have been annihilated by dispersion into distant realms, as would every other church that was planted in subsequent ages, and the Christian community would have been a mere disintegrated mass without organization, and without union or concert of action.

But it will be said that Dr. Harris recognises the fact that the office of teaching was conferred on a class of men especially set apart to that work, and admits the legitimacy of that arrangement in the church of the present age. Yes, he recognises and admits it, and in recognising it, he deserts his doctrine that the proclamation of the gospel to the unconverted is equally the supreme duty of all classes and all individuals. Christ's institution and Dr. Harris's theory are altogether incompatible with each other.

In the fifth place, it is irreconcilable with the fact that the preaching of the gospel by the apostles and the teachers of the first age was successful with only a small portion of their hearers. Were Dr. Harris's theory true, every nation and every individual to whom the gospel is faithfully preached, should be converted; for he asserts that the very com-

mand to preach it to all nations is virtually a promise that if that command is obeyed, or as far as it is obeyed, the word preached shall be made efficacious to the salvation of those to whom it is made known. But the apostles indubitably, and their early disciples through the first sixty or seventy years from the day of Pentecost, preached the gospel faithfully, and were attested in their ministry by miraculous power. Yet of those to whom they proclaimed the glad tidings of salvation, only a small proportion became true converts to the faith. On the day of Pentecost itself, when probably several hundred thousand heard their word—for at that feast a large share of the nation was gathered at Jerusalem—only three thousand were converted; and at the distance of twenty years, though spoken of as many myriads, those who had become disciples of Christ were probably but a small part of the nation. And Paul and his associates in their mission to the nations, instead of being universally successful, were everywhere met by a body of unbelieving and hostile Jews; and after their ceaseless and earnest labors of thirty years, left a great part of the Gentile population of Asia Minor, Macedonia, Achaia, and Italy, under the unmitigated sway of paganism. And such has been the ill success of the faithful witnesses for Christ in every subsequent age. The church of true believers, instead of prevailing, has everywhere been persecuted, driven into seclusion, and almost exterminated. How now is it, that, in the presence of this fact, conspicuous as the sun in the firmament, Dr. Harris could venture to maintain that the gospel is made the means of conversion to men just to the extent in which it is faithfully preached to them? It never has been. It has been heard by a vast share of those to whom it has been made known, only to be rejected; and that is the issue of its proclamation now. On what ground, then, could Dr. Harris aver and build on it the towering structure of his volume, that if the gospel were preached to all the nations now, it would infallibly be the means of their immediate and universal conversion? Why should that effect any more follow now, than under the preaching of the apostles and those first disciples who enjoyed the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and were attested in their ministry by a vast array of stupendous miracles?

Can anything be more manifest than that Dr. H. wrote under the blinding mist of a false theory; that he lost sight entirely of the express teachings of the New Testament on the subject, and the confirmations of their truth by the history of the church through eighteen hundred years? No greater innovation on the words of Christ can be conceived, than would be wrought by the insertion among them of the declaration, That whosoever preaches the gospel to the unsanctified, shall infallibly be the means of converting all those to whom he preaches it; and that all those of the unrenewed to whom the knowledge of the gospel is communicated, shall infallibly be led by it to a saving faith in the Redeemer. Yet these, according to Dr. Harris, are among the most indubitable certainties of which we are assured by the Bible.

In the sixth place, he wholly overlooks the great fact already revealed in the sacred word, that the present is not a dispensation of unmixed and universal mercy, but rather of trial, under which mankind are left in a great measure to act out their unrenewed hearts and reject the salvation that is offered to them; that it is not the purpose of God during it, under any supposable labors of the church, to convert all nations and deliver the world from the reign and curse of sin; that an election only are now to be saved; and that they are to be saved amidst great and fearful difficulties; and that those of them especially who are to be the last in the train, are to go, on their entrance into the kingdom of glory, out of great tribulation from the general apostasy of the nominal church, a furious attempt of the civil rulers to exterminate the true witnesses of Christ by a general slaughter, and a fearful predominance of the infernal powers. Not the slightest notice does he take of this great feature of the present administration of the world. He declaims and reasons everywhere as though no intimations of the sort exist on the sacred page; and as though nothing is wanting but the proclamation of the gospel by the church to all nations, to insure the instant conversion of all to whom its good news shall be made known. This is truly astounding in one undertaking, in a sphere demanding such fidelity to the truth, to make known to the church what God has revealed on the subject.

In the seventh place, he enters into no consideration whatever of the great fact that it is expressly foreshown by Christ that the gospel was not, and is not, under the present dispensation, to be made efficacious to all to whom it is made known, but only to an election; that he forewarned his disciples that instead of meeting a friendly reception from either Jews or Gentiles, they would be repelled by multitudes of the great and powerful especially of both, and hated, persecuted with implacable malignity, and put to death; and that that would be the lot of their successors till he should return to assume the sceptre of the world; that the church itself, in the meantime, in place of a body of pure believers, would consist, in a large degree, like a mixture of tares with wheat, of false professors introduced by the art and malice of Satan; that the teachers and rulers of the church would themselves generally apostatize to a false religion, and, in league with the civil powers, endeavor to suppress the truth and exterminate its faithful witnesses from the earth; that these malign powers will continue in supremacy down to the time of his second coming; and that

by the divine word, but is at war with its most indubitable teachings? Whatever his motives may have been, a course more unworthy of a professed witness of Jesus, more uncandid and more treacherous to the truth, is not often pursued by a heated and bewildered partisan of error.

He thus neither offers any direct proof of his doctrine, nor makes any effort to relieve it from the charge of open contradiction to the Scriptures. He proceeds in an endeavor to corroborate it by a series of indirect arguments, but they are wholly ineffective and fallacious.

Thus he aims, in the second chapter of his first part, to show that his "theory of Christian instrumentality for the conversion of the world is illustrated and enforced from the word of God;" but the first point which he proves is simply that, under the various dispensations anterior to Christ's advent, those who filled the office of patriarchs and leaders were under powerful *inducements* to promote the piety o their families and kindred; and that those generally to whom the revelations were made, stood in such intimate relations to one another, that they necessarily exerted on each other very important religious influences. But that is a wholly different proposition from his theory that God "made it imperative on every individual, who was renewed," under those dispensations, "to consecrate his entire influence, from the moment of his conversion, to the diffusion" of the truths of the dispensation under which he lived, and that he promised that those truths should be made effective to the conversion of every one to whom they were communicated. —P. 87.

He next alleges the fact that Christ, during his residence on the earth, was entirely devoted to the work for which he became incarnate, as a proof that his disciples also are to devote themselves entirely to the ends for which they are renewed by him, and made heirs of his salvation. But that does not prove Dr. Harris's doctrine that the great and exclusive end for which they are renewed, is that they may labor to convert others, nor that their labors for that purpose will infallibly, in all cases, be made efficacious.

He cites the fact also that the Spirit of God is *sometimes* poured out when the gospel is preached by men, and *some* of those are converted to whom the word is communicated,

as a confirmation of his doctrine. But the fact that the Spirit is poured out at times when the gospel is preached by its heralds, is no proof that it always is; nor is the fact that *some* of those to whom the gospel is communicated by human instrumentality at the times of the Spirit's effusion are renewed, any proof that all who then hear it are. The effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost is no proof that he was poured out in like manner on all other occasions when the gospel was preached; nor is the renovation of three thousand of those who heard it on that day proof that the tens and probably hundreds of thousands of others who heard it on that occasion, were also converted.

He alleges, in like manner, the laboriousness of the apostles and other primitive teachers as corroborating his doctrine. But the fact that the apostles, evangelists, and other teachers were commissioned to preach the gospel to the nations, and devoted themselves with zeal to that work, is no proof of Dr. Harris's theory that all other believers were required to "consecrate their entire influence from the

"It becomes important to inquire, whether the universal triumph of the gospel is to be achieved by the noiseless and gradually augmented instrumentality of the Christian church, accompanied by the energizing influence of the Holy Spirit; *whether it is to be effected in a manner quite irrespective of such instrumentality, and calculated to disparage it before the eyes of the universe as misplaced and offensive;* or whether the grand consummation shall be realized by a middle course, which, while it will be always demanding, employing, and absorbing all the sanctified resources of the Christian church, will yet leave room for the marked, and frequent, and direct interference of heaven, and which will render such interposition indispensable to final and complete success.

"In proportion as the time of the end approaches, the question as to the relation which sanctified human instrumentality bears to it acquires additional interest. A thousand signs are supposed to prognosticate that the end draweth nigh; and each of them awakens the inquiry anew, What is the relation which the sanctified agency of Christians sustains to it? Is their benevolent activity essential, in the order of means, to the latter-day glory? Or does the tenor of prophecy indicate that so far from contributing aught to its arrival and its splendor, they should rather 'stand still and see the salvation of God?'

"Still more important does this inquiry become in proportion as Christians, awakening to what they regard as the voice of duty, multiply their institutions and enlarge the sphere of their activity, animated by the hope that their humble endeavors shall certainly be crowned with success. Who that surveys the wide field of missionary effort in the present day, and marks the note of preparation for still greater activity, can feel indifferent to the inquiry, whether or not *it is to lead to any valuable result?* Who does not perceive that on the answer to this inquiry depends, if not the very continuance of our activity, much at least of the cheerfulness of our obedience, and the degree of our devotedness? And who does not perceive that if the glory of the Millennium is to burst on the world quite irrespective of Christian instrumentality, to urge such instrumentality as the appointed means of hastening that period is to indulge in delusion for the present, and to prepare mortification for the future.

"But should there be those in the Church, of any consideration or influence, *whose views of prophecy induce them to depreciate,* IF NOT EVEN TO DEPRECATE, *the high attempt which aims*

at the conversion of the world, it becomes a step of the first importance to inquire into the authority of such views, and if found unscriptural, *to obviate their paralysing effect.* We are aware indeed that among those who, for the sake of distinction, are called Millenarians, there are to be found divines of considerable reputation, and Christians of the greatest sanctity. And equally aware are we, that under the generic name of Millenarianism is included a great diversity of opinions as to the *order of the events* immediately preceding the millennium, and *the kind of means* which will be made contributory to it—that it does not necessarily disparage the benevolent endeavors of the present day, nor seek to discourage them by constantly harping on their ultimate failure—but that many of them who hold it *profess to derive from it* motives to increased diligence in the cause of God. And accordingly some of them, we are aware, number among the liberal and active supporters of our religious institutions. *Still, however, we cannot but* SUSPECT *that in* MANY *of such instances, we are indebted for what they do rather to the very natural desire of* RECOMMENDING THEIR PECULIAR VIEWS TO OTHERS, *than to the views themselves—that their conduct is in this particular better than their* CREED—that it is the triumph of their piety over their opinions—and that, as a vehicle put into rapid motion will continue to advance for a while by its own momentum, after the power which first propelled it is withdrawn, *their present activity is the result of principles which date anterior to their peculiar views of prophecy.* Our warrant for this fear is to be found in the fact that those who, prior to their adoption of Millenarianism, did run well, and who even subsequently continued for a while to move in the same direction, a very large proportion are now acting, in reference to the diffusion of the gospel, as if a prophet had been deputed to say to them, 'Your strength is to sit still.'

"That such must be the necessary effect of all views of the future which tend to show that the endeavors of the present will prove abortive, is evident. Hope is the parent of all activity. To be doomed to labor without hope has been mythologically represented as one of the punishments of the lost. To expect, then, that the same efforts will be made where *failure* is certain as where success is anticipated, is to overlook a fundamental principle of human nature. . . . As long as the result of a course of duty is *doubtful* only, hope and fear alternate; nor would it be possible for fear entirely to prevail without bringing the mind to the full and fatal pause of despair. But in the question

under consideration, *we are not supposed to be left in a state of uncertainty as to the issue of our endeavors, but to be distinctly apprised that they will end in defeat.* And the known and inevitable tendency of such a state of mind, is (with certain exceptions of the kind we have stated) to produce relative inaction." —Pp. 115–117.

He thus represents the doctrine held by Millenarians that the nations are not to be converted, and the world become the scene of universal righteousness and peace, anterior to Christ's second coming, as the doctrine that no success whatever is to attend the present efforts of the church to convert men, that they are not "to lead to any valuable result," but "will prove abortive," "will end in defeat." But that representation is wholly unjust. Millenarians hold no such doctrine, nor any other that involves it or yields it any countenance. While they receive with full faith the numerous predictions that the world is to remain in open and general revolt as it now is, and the church, in a large measure, in apostasy till the time of Christ's coming; they hold, also, with full conviction, that the church is bound by Christ's injunction to proclaim the gospel to all nations, and that he will now make it efficacious, when preached to the heathen, on as large a scale as it is ordinarily made effective by his Spirit to those to whom it is preached of the populations that are already nominally Christianized; and that there is as large encouragement, therefore, in that relation to communicate the gospel to the unevangelized, as there is to continue to preach it to those who are already living in its light. How could it be otherwise, since the experiment of the last forty or fifty years has shown that the gospel is proportionally as successful when made known to the inhabitants of the Pacific Isles, of China, India, and Africa, and the aborigines of this continent, as it is when proclaimed to the English, Germans, or French, or the inhabitants of the United States? Yet it is that false doctrine, falsely ascribed to Millenarians, that he assails, and the confutation of which he treats as a proof that the prophetic Scriptures furnish not a hint that the world is not to be converted by human instrumentality, and antecedently to Christ's second coming. Thus he argues from the fact that Christ commands his disciples

to preach the gospel to every creature, that their obedience to that command will be attended with a measure of success proportional to their fidelity. Very well; admit it. It is precisely what all Millenarians hold. But the certainty that *some* measure of success will attend the preaching of the gospel to the heathen is no proof surely that every individual pagan or other false worshipper to whom it is preached will be converted, and that the whole world will thus be brought to submission to Christ's sceptre anterior to his second advent; which are the propositions Dr. Harris employs it to demonstrate! He argues, also, that the doctrine he assails cannot be true, from the consideration that to suppose that no blessing whatever should attend the communication of the gospel to all nations, is inconsistent with God's sincerity, benignity, and wisdom; and with the office, also, of the Holy Spirit. Admit that it is; yet inasmuch as neither Millenarians nor any other class entertain that supposition, its inconsistency with fact and truth is no proof that the wholly different doctrine held by Millenarians is not true;

have no adequate motive to lift a finger for the promotion of missions, unless he were assured that it would be efficacious to the conversion of all to whom the word of life was by his means preached ; and should therefore, if he took any part in it, act only from hypocritical motives. It is a pity that he had not self-knowledge and candor enough to make this disclosure of himself directly, in place of wrapping it up in a charge on those to whom the imputation is a gross and inexcusable calumny. The knowledge that the gospel is not now to be the means of salvation to all to whom it is made known, and that the world is not to be converted till Christ comes, is no more to Millenarians an obstacle to communicating it to as many, and thereby saving as many as is practicable, than it was to the apostles and primitive Christians. The apostles and teachers of the first age were, to a man, Millenarians, and knew that only a part of those to whom they made known the word of life would be converted, and only a part of those to whom it should be preached in after ages till Christ should come. Yet that knowledge did not prevent them from the most strenuous efforts to proclaim it to as many as they could, and draw as many to the faith as were foreordained to eternal life. They counted it an honor and a joy to be the instruments of leading very moderate numbers to Christ compared to the multitudes who remained under the sway of sin. And were they not sincere? Were it not to shock every Christian heart to intimate that their acts were inconsistent with their faith; that their submission to toils, self-denials, hatred, persecution, torture, and death, was simply to keep up a show of consistency and devotedness which they could not have felt? Yet Dr. Harris's imputation is, in fact, levelled at them, as directly as it is at modern Millenarians, who hold the same faith and act on the same principles. In what a sad depth of confusion and error did he involve himself! It is no more inconsistent in Millenarians of the present day to labor sincerely and earnestly for the spread of the gospel, than it was in the apostles and martyrs of the first age, with the knowledge that they were not only not to draw all whom they should address to Christ, but that they should be repelled by far the greater number, pursued with hatred and vengeance, and at length put to death.

That the Millenarians of Great Britain and her colonies

are sincere in their interest and activity in missions, Dr. Harris had ample proof, not only from the high character of those at home, but especially from the well-known fact that a large share of the most esteemed and effective missionaries from England and Scotland are themselves Millenarians, and a very large share of the most effective supporters of missions among the English and Scotch residents in Africa, India, China, and the islands of the Southern and Pacific Oceans. Is this large body of men, not surpassed by any others in intelligence, high character, laboriousness, and success, to be branded as hypocrites because if—instead of holding and acting on the truth as they do—they held the false theory Dr. Harris unjustly ascribes to them,—consistency would, in his judgment, drive them from the work, or, at best, only permit them to pursue it without faith and without sincerity? Thanks be to God, they do not need vindication from his gratuitous and absurd aspersions. They are known throughout the world, and known to be as incapable of the treachery to Christ, to which Dr. H.'s theory

special pleading, distortion, prejudice, and partisanship reign throughout, and render it wholly unworthy of the subject, and undeserving the commendation it has received from a share of the religious public. Nor can anything be more certain than that, much as it has been applauded, and largely as it has been used as a means of exciting the church to a higher zeal for missions, its chief elements are not really believed by those who receive and commend it. Its most essential doctrines are, that every individual who is renewed, is bound, from the moment of conversion, to consecrate himself entirely to the conversion of the world, and that he is to labor for that end with implicit faith that God will make his labors, as far as they extend, efficacious. But who but wild enthusiasts and half-delirious fanatics ever believed those propositions? None of the missions of the present day are conducted on that conviction. Not a solitary herald is sent forth by the church at home, not one who is laboring in the fields of Africa, of India, of China, of the isles of the southern and western ocean, toils with that expectation. Not a solitary sect or church in Europe or America has any such faith. If they had, they would exemplify it by migrating universally to the regions where paganism reigns, and devoting themselves to the conversion of the unevangelized to the faith. This theory is thus shown to be false by the faith and experience of all the missions ever undertaken by the church, and of all churches and individuals at home. No minister or private believer at home regards God as pledged to convert every individual whom he endeavors to lead to Christ. Such a persuasion would bespeak delirium, and could only issue in disappointment, and would be likely, in many instances, to end in the disbelief of religion itself. Dr. Harris and his coadjutors never, in any measure, acted up to his doctrine. Yet his work, presented to the church under auspices that naturally gave it conspicuity and authority, and generally commended by the press, has had a wide diffusion, and exerted a large influence.

Its day, however, and the day of similar works, there is reason to think, is nearly over. The reception of such an Essay, put forth now for the first time, would be far less general and hearty than that which his met at its introduction to the public. Great changes have since taken place

in the expectation of the churches of large and speedy success in the attempt to convert the heathen. It is found that the gospel is not made efficacious to them, on any greater scale proportionally, than it is to the unrenewed at home. Thousands and tens of thousands have been led to re-examine the teachings of the New Testament on the subject, and have become satisfied that Dr. Harris's theory is unscriptural and absurd; and preconceptions and prejudices that have been obstacles to the truth, have, in a measure, given way in the minds of many others. It is a fit time, therefore, for a calm reconsideration of the subject; and we propose in the remainder of this article, to state briefly what the Scriptures teach in regard to the success of the gospel, the character of the church, and the state of the world during the present dispensation; and the time when, and the conditions under which, the world is to be converted.

I. In the first place, then, it is foreshown that, during the present dispensation, salvation is not to be embraced by those universally to whom the gospel is preached; but that

born affections, when called to the self-denials, and perhaps reproaches and persecutions of a holy life, find the service of Christ wholly distasteful, and relapse to the world. The third, and only other class symbolized by the ground, that however in other respects cultivated, is preoccupied by thorn roots, consists of those who, though religiously educated, and raised to strong convictions of duty, and solemn resolves to perform it, yet allow their natural affections to continue in the predominance, like thorns previously established in a soil where wheat is sown—and notwithstanding the remonstrances of reason and conscience, neglect and reject it, because of their occupation with worldly cares, and love of riches and pleasure. And each of these classes —those who reject it from insensibility, from unwillingness to meet the self-denials and persecutions to which it subjects them, and from enthralment to the cares and love of the world, comprises a far greater number than the fourth who receive and obey it.

We have thus a representation, from the lips of Christ himself, in the most specific and impressive form, that the gospel is not, under the present dispensation, to prove efficacious to all to whom it is made known, but that only a small number, compared to the vast crowds symbolized by the trodden way, the soil underlaid by rock, and the ground occupied by thorns, are to receive its truths and yield the fruits that spring from them in the heart new created in knowledge and righteousness. And this great prediction has been verified in every community in which the gospel has been proclaimed, from the day of its utterance to the present time. No herald has ever announced the glad tidings, no scene in which they have been uttered, whether in the realms of idolatry or in Christendom, but has witnessed its accomplishment; and it is to continue to be verified to the close of this dispensation. It precludes, accordingly, the notion that the conversion of the world is to take place under the administration God is now exercising.

II. But Christ forewarned those whom he sent forth to preach the gospel, not only that they were not to meet with universal nor general success; but that they were to encounter a stern and relentless resistance from many, and be hated, persecuted, and put to death. "Behold I send you forth as

sheep in the midst of wolves: Beware of men; for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child; and the children shall rise up against their parents and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all nations for my name sake; but he that endureth to the end shall be saved." Matthew x. 16–22. And this war on them he foreshows, Matt. xxiv. 9–14, is to continue to his second coming; also, Mark xiii. 9–13; Luke xxi. 12–17. And this prediction has been verified in an awful form from the first promulgation of the gospel to the present day. The persecution of the apostles was commenced by the Jewish rulers at Jerusalem a few days after their first sermon at Pentecost, and spread into other parts of the empire as churches were planted in them; and the Jews were soon succeeded by the Gentiles, who began a series of cruel and bloody persecutions that continued with few intermissions throughout the

ther till the harvest: the harvest is the end of the age, and the reapers are the angels: as, therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be with the children of the wicked one at the end of this age. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all that offend, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," out of which the children of the wicked have just been gathered. Matt. xiii. 24–30; 37–43. As this intermixture of the wicked with the children of God is to continue to the end of this dispensation, and as they are then to be removed from the kingdom by destruction, not by conversion, it is clear that all the inhabitants of the world are not to be converted during this dispensation.

IV. Christ foretold, also, that the wicked, thus intermixed with the righteous in the church, are not to be quiescent and harmless, but are to apostatize from the gospel which they profess to receive, and become enemies, and persecute the children of God with whom they are intermixed. "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you, and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then [when persecution thus rages against you] shall many [who profess my name] be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall arise and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." Matt. xxiv. 9–12. That they betray *one another* shows that both the betrayer and the betrayed belong to the church. Those not professing to be Christ's disciples could not betray one another as such. This prediction also has had a direful fulfilment. On the legalization of Christianity by Constantine, a vast body of pagans entered the church from mere motives of fashion and policy; and ere long the subjects of the state were required to be members of the church—submission to the church and participation in its sacraments being conditions of the rights of citizenship—and that rule prevailed in the eastern empire as long as that empire subsisted, and has prevailed in the main in the states of the western empire to the present day. Instead of the conversion of the world by the gospel, the church

itself, it was revealed, was not to be converted by it, but a large share of its members were to be the children of the great enemy of Christ's kingdom.

V. It was foreshown, moreover, that the civil rulers of the Roman empire, instead of obeying the gospel, were to usurp dominion over it, and over the church, endeavor to force its ministers and members into subservience to their will, and persecute and drive them for their allegiance to Christ into concealment for safety. Thus the great red dragon, the symbol of the rulers of the whole Roman empire down to the conquest of the West by the Goths, and of the eastern empire through the thousand years that followed to its fall, drove the woman, the representative of the true church, into the wilderness, where a place was prepared for her nourishment twelve hundred and sixty years: and was wroth with her, and persecuted her, and made war with the remnant of her seed who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus. Rev. xii. 3–17. The rulers of the western empire also, after it passed under the dominion of the Goths, arrogated the rights of God

mony of Jesus, to worship it, by ascribing to it the divine rights which it usurps, receiving the religion it imposes on them, and applauding it in its persecution of those who worship God. And this prophecy has had a verification so conspicuous, so vast, and so dreadful, that all eyes see it, and all acknowlege it. The persecution of believers, commenced by the dragon in the strife between Paganism and Christianity, was continued in the eastern empire till its fall, at the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, and has been since, in a measure, in the dominion of the civil head of the Greek church. It was commenced by the Gothic kings also on the legalization of the church in their several dominions, and is continued to the present day. There is not a government in Europe that does not claim the right to dictate to its subjects what faith they shall hold, and what worship they shall offer; there is not one that tolerates dissent from the nationalized church, that does not grant the toleration it permits by legislative acts, and treat it as a concession of what it might, if it pleased, withhold.

VI. It is foreshown that a power of much the same character should arise also in the nominal church, that should claim to be the vicegerent of God, arrogate supreme authority over religion and over the church, introduce a false worship, and tyrannize over and kill the true servants of God. The second beast, that came up out of the earth, with two horns like a lamb, and a voice as a dragon, was to exercise all the power in kinds—civil and religious—of the first beast, and cause the earth and them who dwell therein to worship the first beast, by assent to its impious claims. "And he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by the miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast, saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword and did live; and he had power to give life unto the image of the beast that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast, should be killed." Rev. xiii. 2–17. This prophecy also has received a fulfilment that is conspicuous to all eyes; the papacy, in which, as in the monarchies of the states, the civil and ecclesiastical power is united, being the rule denoted by the beast from the earth; the

image corresponding to the beast, being the Catholic hierarchy, coextensive with the ten kingdoms, with the pope as its head, claiming authority over the states of the empire, as well as its churches, and persecuting and punishing with death all who refuse to submit to its authority, and to offer the false and impious worship which it enjoins. This apostate and corrupting power, instead of converting the nations, has aimed, and aims still, to strike Christianity itself and its witnesses from existence.

VII. These malignant powers, whose whole aim is to obstruct Christ's kingdom, and draw men to a false worship, are to continue their sway down to the close of the present dispensation. Thus, instead of being converted before, or at Christ's coming, it is foreshown, Dan. vii. 9–14, that the wild beast is to be judged and given to the burning flame, at the time that the Son of Man comes in the clouds of heaven, and receives the dominion of the earth, that all its nations may serve him. The man of sin, who exalts himself above God, and claims to be divine, is to continue his career until the Lord consumes him by the breath of his

by the impress of his name on their foreheads, and when those who survive will go out of great tribulation, as they enter the kingdom, which is immediately to follow it. Instead of passing from a millennium of peace and rest, they will go from a conflict in which they would have fallen martyrs, were it not for the direct intervention of Christ to deliver them.

IX. The last days of the present dispensation, in place of days of universal righteousness, are to be perilous times, in which men generally will abandon themselves to the sway of their evil passions, 2 Tim. iii. 1–5, and will deride the predicted coming of Christ, 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4. When the witnesses are slain, the multitude are to exult, Rev. xi. 9, 16: and the success that is to attend the emissaries, denoted by the unclean spirits from the mouth of the beast, the false prophet, and the dragon, who are to go forth to the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them together to the great battle in which they are to endeavor to blot Christ's kingdom from the earth, indicates that the crowd are to approve of their attempt, and are to be wrought up to extreme rage and desperation. Rev. xvi. 13–16.

X. The consternation of the inhabitants of the world generally when Christ comes, shows that they are to be his enemies, not his friends. "When the sign of the Son of Man shall appear in heaven, then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with great power and glory." Matt. xxiv. 30. "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." Rev. i. 7. Why should they wail and cry to the rocks and mountains to fall on them and hide them from the face of the Lamb, if they are not at enmity with him, and conscious that he has come to take vengeance on them?

XI. The multitude of the impiously wicked, who are to be destroyed at his coming, shows that the world is to be in general revolt from him. That their numbers are to be very great is symbolized by the vintage of the earth, when the cluster, crushed in the wine-press of the wrath of God, yielded a river of blood that ran up to the horses' bridles

for the space of sixteen hundred furlongs. Rev. xiv. 18–20, and xix. 17–21. It is indicated also in the judgment of the living nations, Matt. xxv. 31–33; 41–46, and in Zech. xiv. 1–3, 12–15; and is expressly foretold Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16.

XII. It is revealed with equal clearness, on the other side, that it is after Christ's second coming, and assumption of the sceptre of the earth, that the conversion of the world is to take place. Thus, it was after the image was smitten on its feet of iron and clay, and they were broken in pieces, that the stone, the symbol of Christ's kingdom, became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. Dan. ii. 34, 35. It was at the coming of the Son of Man, in the clouds of heaven, at the time of the judgment and destruction of the persecuting wild beast, that he received the dominion of the earth, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him, and established a kingdom under the whole heaven which is not to pass away. Dan. vii. 13–27. It is at the sound of the seventh trumpet, when the last judgments are to be inflicted on the great enemies of God, symbolized by the beast and the woman seated on it, that the kingdom of this

and promises his presence with them to the end of the age; and he attempts to make them proofs of his doctrine by assuming and affirming that those commands and promises are pledges that the gospel preached by them shall be made efficacious to all nations. But that assumption, so loudly proclaimed and so confidently asserted, is wholly groundless. The command respects the work the apostles were to perform, not the effect of their labors on those whom they were to teach; and the promise was of the presence Christ was to grant *them* in their ministry, not that he was to grant the nations whom they were to address. The command to them to preach the gospel to all mankind, no more implies that all to whom they should preach should be renewed, than the command to all men everywhere to repent and believe, implies that all to whom it is addressed will be led by the renewing Spirit to obey it. But beyond this, Dr. Harris was precluded from such an assumption by the fact, on the one side, that Christ expressly forewarned his disciples in the parable of the sower, and many other discourses, that the gospel was not to be accepted and become efficacious to all to whom it should be made known; but should by a great share of hearers be neglected and rejected: and, on the other, by the fact that it was not in reality made efficacious to more than a very small part of those to whom the apostles actually proclaimed it. Far the greater number, both of Jews and Gentiles, to whom it was made known in the first age, rejected it with obstinacy and passion, and either persecuted, or acquiesced in the persecution and slaughter of those who taught or embraced it. This fact alone, proclaiming as it does with a thunder-voice, the error of his construction of the command and promise, should have withheld Dr. Harris from the presumption of repeating and persisting in it. For if his construction of the command and promise is legitimate, how happened it that the pledge that the gospel should be made the means of conversion to all to whom it was preached, was not kept to the apostles themselves, to whom Dr. H. holds it was given? But as no such pledge was verified to the apostles, nor has been to any of their successors in the office of heralds of the glad tidings to the nations, how is it to be proved that it is to be verified to any others who are to

fill that office under the present dispensation? If there is nothing in the command and promise inconsistent with the fact in the first age, and in all that have followed, that a large part of the hearers of the glad tidings are left to reject them, and go on in unbelief and perish, how is it to be proved from the command and promise, that a like proportion of those to whom the gospel shall hereafter be preached, anterior to Christ's second advent, will not also be left to reject it and perish?

The other class of passages cited by Dr. Harris to sustain his theory, are such expressions as, taken by themselves, simply foreshow that all nations are at length to be converted. These he construes as foreshowing that their conversion is to take place in the present dispensation, before Christ's second coming; although every one of them taken from a context that indicates the time when it is to be fulfilled, defines that time as after Christ's second advent, and the commencement of his reign on the earth. Those that are disconnected with a definition of the time, are no more

riches of his glory toward vessels of mercy he before prepared for glory, even us whom he called not only of Jews, but also of Gentiles;" has he not a right to do it? Rom. ix. 18, 24. Here his determination to show the wrath due to sin, and his leaving men to reject the gospel and perish, as they do under the present dispensation, are represented as in order that the riches of the glory of the perfections may be known, that are displayed in the redemption of those who are saved. That is, the exhibition that is now taking place, on the one hand, of the heart of man in his rejection of the gospel, and the other sins he is perpetrating; and on the other, of the right of God to punish him, is necessary, in order that the wisdom, power, and love of God may be understood, by which those who are made vessels of mercy are saved. God has not only a right, therefore, to allow that manifestation to take place, but it is necessary to his vindication; it is necessary to the universe, in order that the glory of his skill and grace may be understood and appreciated. But when that manifestation of what man is, what sin is, and what the punishment is that is due to it, has reached a certain point, it will have filled the office for which it is permitted, and not need to be extended any farther. When, therefore, that point is reached, God may change his administration over the world, and save all that thereafter come into existence, without a probability that the universe will misunderstand it, or fail to discern and acknowledge the glory of the power, and intelligence, and love, by which it is accomplished, and that point, it is foreshown, will be reached when Christ comes the second time, and closes the present, and institutes a new dispensation. "For as ye, Gentiles, in times past, have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these, the Jews, now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all—shut them all up in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon them all." Rom. xi. 30, 32. That is, he first called the Jews and left the Gentiles uncalled, and then called the Gentiles and left the Jews uncalled, and permitted each, in both conditions in which they were placed, to show that, left without the renewing power of the Spirit, they universally reject God:

and that demonstration is allowed in order that when it is finished he may have mercy on all, both Jews and Gentiles, who thereafter come into life, without any possibility of a misunderstanding by any of the condition from which they who are redeemed are saved, or the riches of the grace that redeems them; and the time when that demonstration is to be completed, and the redemption of all to commence, is the time when Christ comes and assumes the dominion of the world. The time when all Israel is to be saved, is the time when the Deliverer shall come to Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. Rom. xi. 26.

That men reject on so vast a scale, and are to continue to reject the gospel during the present dispensation, instead of an obstacle to the final redemption of the race, is an indispensable condition of it. It is to be because so adequate a manifestation is now made of the alienation and ruin of man, and of the right of God to abandon and punish him; that no further demonstrations of them will be necessary at the close of this economy, but Christ may then interpose in the

to them. It is taught directly, explicitly, in every variety of form, and with the most impressive emphasis, is exemplified by parables drawn from the realms of nature, set forth by symbolic representations of the great agents who are to continue the reign of evil in the world to the close of this dispensation, their catastrophe is depicted at the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, and the conversion of the nations is foreshown as to follow his coming. Not a solitary mode of prediction is omitted that is needful to give certainty and clearness to this great disclosure of the divine counsels; not a stroke that is requisite to give completeness to the portraiture and guide the humble and impartial to a discernment of its meaning. Christ proclaims, with his own voice, that only a few of those to whom the gospel should be preached would receive and obey it; that those who were to go forth to preach it, in place of meeting a friendly reception, were to be hated, repelled, and put to death; and that a large share of those who were to profess his name, instead of disciples, were to be the subjects and emissaries of Satan. And he foreshowed, through the apostles, that the ministers of the church itself were, ere long, to apostatize, and teach, and spread a false religion; that the rulers of the state and the church would usurp dominion over the gospel and over men in their relations to God, and beguiling and forcing the multitude to an impious faith and homage, would persecute the true worshippers and witnesses of God, and endeavor to exterminate them from the earth; and that these malign powers will continue their career till Christ comes, and consigning them to destruction, takes possession of the world as his kingdom, and brings the nations to submission to his sceptre. This is the only picture that is drawn in the sacred word of the present dispensation. The prophets speak but one voice, and that voice is heard in all their great utterances. There is not another feature of the divine purposes, there is not another characteristic of the administration that is to continue during the present economy, drawn on the inspired page with such frequency, such distinctness, and in such impressive colors. And this picture has been verified with equal certainty and distinctness in every age since it was drawn. A large share of those to whom the gospel has been

preached have, in every period from its first promulgation, rejected it. The apostles and other heralds who first preached the gospel to Jews and Gentiles, met a stern repulse from the crowds, and were imprisoned, scourged, and in many instances put to death, and their faithful successors were pursued with hatred, opposition, and violence, through seventeen centuries, and vast numbers of them consigned to the block, the gibbet, and the stake, for their fidelity; and it is only by sufferance, in a large part of Europe, that they are now permitted to utter the testimony of Jesus. The church has consisted through many ages in a large degree of the merely worldly, and has apostatized from the gospel to a false faith and superstitious and impious worship; the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of Asia and Europe have usurped dominion over religion and the church, led their subjects generally into apostasy, and endeavored to exterminate the true teachers and worshippers from the earth; and they persist still in their usurpations, and are animated in a measure with a disposition to

tance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. Those who affect to find a different revelation in the sacred word, who proclaim a conversion of the world by human means, under the present dispensation, and deny, even, as many do, that Christ is to reign on the earth, are not expositors of the word, but prophets out of their own hearts. It is sad to see how many, from the prepossessions of education, or other causes, join that train, whose intelligence, faith in the great doctrines of redemption, and candor on other themes, should place them on the side of truth in respect to this. But we trust the day of prejudice, misconception, and indifference, is passing away. The light of truth is ere long to break on the church in such resplendence that none but blind eyes can fail to see it, and under its awe-inspiring disclosures the people of God, instead of being smitten into unbelief and a remission of efforts to proclaim the gospel to the world, as such prognosticators as Dr. Harris imagine, will be roused to a thousand times the faith, the self-denial, the love, the zeal, the hope, the activity they now feel and exhibit, and will at once,—as is foreshown in the vision of the angel who proclaims Christ's coming to judge them, and summon them to receive and worship him,—carry the gospel to all the tribes and kindreds of the earth.

Art. II.—Notes on Scripture.

Matthew xx. 20–xxii. 14.

Matt. xx. 20, 21: "Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children, with her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said to her, What wilt thou? She said unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand and the other on thy left, in thy kingdom."

According to Mark (x. 35), it was James and John who made this request, and it is evident, from Matthew's account, that they at least joined in it (vs. 22). But we may well marvel that these brethren should even allow such a re-

quest to be made, after the promise the Lord had given them, as well as to the other apostles, in reply to the question of Peter (Matt. xix. 27, 28). He had promised each a throne and dominion over a tribe of Israel in the world to come (Palingenesia). Yet not content, they would occupy the thrones nearest to the King, their master. We must remember, too, that James and John had witnessed the transfiguration, and must have had higher conceptions of the glory to which they aspired than any other of the apostles excepting Peter. The request, and the indignation it excited, reveal the imperfection of their knowledge and character at that time, and with this view especially we notice the passage. One would think that the lowest place in such a kingdom would be glorious enough to satisfy their loftiest wish. But the request displayed their ignorance, and so the Lord told them. It was made no doubt with the full belief that the expected kingdom was soon to be established in outward glory at Jerusalem, and of course before their death. The other apostles, though with less knowledge of the glory of the kingdom, displayed the same

was the plan the Father had ordained. In answering the question affirmatively, they answered ignorantly. Of themselves they could do neither. Hence the Saviour confirmed their answer with a promise of divine power, as if he had said: Ye know neither what ye ask, nor what ye say; but I grant you this.

Vs. 23. "Ye shall" (be enabled by the divine power and grace to) "drink indeed of my cup, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with."

These words we regard as a promise in answer to the mother's request. It was not the thing she asked, but what the Saviour saw proper to grant. It was an assurance to these brethren, that they should be sharers with him in sufferings and glory (see Rev. i. 9), and an assurance also of his divine aid to endure the one and attain the other.

Vs. 23. "But to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but [or except to those] for whom it is prepared of my Father."

By these words the Saviour denies, or rather refuses to promise beforehand, the distinctions especially requested; leaving them to the disposal of the divine decree, in conformity with which he would, in all things, regulate and administer his kingdom.* This (23d) verse then contains a promise made and a promise withheld.

But according to the common interpretation it contains no promise whatever—only a prediction of sufferings, expressed under the two forms of "drinking of a cup," and "being baptized." The sense, however, appears to be: "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup of sorrows (see Matt. xxvi. 39) and be baptized with my baptism, by which your souls shall first be renewed and sanctified, and your bodies at last be

---

* The interpolated words in the English version, "*it shall be given*" to them, etc., should be stricken out. Our Lord elsewhere represents himself as the sovereign arbiter of the rewards of his kingdom (Luke xix. 11–27, and see John v. 22, 27; Matt. xxviii. 18; John xvii. 2; xiii. 3). The rendering of the Syriac version is in conformity with that above given. (See Fabricius' Lat. version, and Murdock's Eng. version of the Syriac N. T., also Tremellius.) Diodate interpolates the words *sarà dato;* Erasmus, *contingat;* the Vulgate, *vobis.* Montanus renders verbatim, without interpolation. The particle 'αλλα is sometimes used in the sense of *except.* (See LXX. in Num. xxxv. 33; Dan. ii. 11; Mark iv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 4.)

glorified and made like unto my own body of glory (see Philip. iii. 21; 1 John iii. 2; Rom. viii. 29); but to sit on my right hand and on my left, enjoying the first places in my kingdom, is not mine to give, except to those for whom it has been prepared by my Father." (See the note on Acts, chap. ii.; Journ. vol. x. pp. 548–550.) The prediction of sufferings is emblematically represented by the words "drink of my cup." The promise of glorification is involved in the word "baptism." Thus understood, the words beautifully illustrate the gracious character of the Saviour. The mother asked for glory and distinction in glory, for her two sons. The Saviour promised them glory, great glory, not the reverse of what they desired. (See Luke xi. 11, 12.) But it was a glory to be attained only through sufferings (drinking of his cup), which his grace should strengthen them to endure.

It is a further objection to the common interpretation that neither James nor John suffered death by crucifixion. James was put to death by the sword (Acts xii. 2). John died, it is supposed, a natural death, at an advanced age.

and the feelings of this evangelist have been when he composed his gospel. The Holy Spirit had taught him the meaning of the Saviour's words, and shown him something of the nature and glory of the kingdom which they all then ignorantly judged of by the kingdoms of this world. The day of Pentecost produced a wonderful transformation of the character of the apostles intellectually and morally.

Matt. xx. 25–27. "But Jesus called them and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them" (the nations, their subjects), "and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant" (Mark x. 45).

All the apostles had taken it for granted that the same system and arrangement of things which they observed in the world would continue to subsist in the kingdom they expected. This misconception is apparent from the passage just considered, and our Lord, in these verses, takes occasion to correct it. He told them that although they should be princes in his kingdom they would be most unlike the princes of this world, for they lord it over their subjects;—but in his kingdom places of eminence and power would be places of service, and the greatest eminence would be inseparably joined with the humblest service. As if he had said: "I have promised you thrones and dominion over the tribes of Israel, but do not think that you will exercise it after the manner of the princes of this world."

The great law of my kingdom, is the law of love. Your office will be to impart good to those whom you will rule over, and serve them, not to be served by them. In so doing you will most resemble God, whose nature it is to impart blessings to the humblest as well as the most exalted of his creatures, without recompense, which the infinite fulness of his nature renders him incapable of receiving" (Ps. l. 7–14).

It cannot be denied, however, that this preconceived opinion of the apostles, while they were yet unsanctified, has greatly prevailed in the visible church, almost from its origin, notwithstanding these words of the Saviour. The hierarchy of Rome—while assuming for its sovereign pontiff the title, *Servus Servorum Dei*—has exercised lordship over the

church and the world after the manner of Gentile princes; and other branches of the church, since the Reformation, have frequently lost sight of, perhaps quite forgotten, the kind of dominion the Saviour promised—even while professing to follow this fundamental law.

What our Lord said on this occasion to the twelve apostles, he said to all his elect people. (See Rev. i. 6; iii. 21.) And if it be inquired, what occasions there can be for such rule or service, and what field vast enough for the unceasing employment of their whole body, we can only answer we know not. Our conceptions on these questions may, in other respects, be as far from the reality as were the conceptions of the apostles upon the nature of the pre-eminence they coveted. But as we are taught expressly that the happiness of the elect will consist essentially in service, we confidently infer that a service ample enough to engage all their energies will be assigned to them (Luke xix. 17–19). Something of this kind seems to be intimated in Luke xvi. 9—an obscure passage—the precise meaning of which it is impossible for us to apprehend without more knowledge of the economy of the world of Redemption. (See Heb. i. 14; ii.5.) Besides, we know that in the "Father's house are many mansions" (John xiv. 2); and to all these the dominion of our Lord extends. The creation is vast already, infinitely beyond our highest conceptions; and for aught we know—rather as we have reason to believe (John v. 17)—the creative energies of the Divine nature will be for ever employed in enlarging it on every border. But however we may speculate, thus much we know, that the Lord will provide the means of fulfilling everything he has promised or purposed.

Matt. xx. 28. "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto [served] but to minister [serve others], and [rather say, even] to give his life a ransom for many."

Our Lord enforces his doctrine by his example. As Son of Man, he was and is the Lord of the world. (See note on Matt. xvi. 27.) As if he had said, "If I, the King of the kings and Lord of the lords of the whole earth have come to do service to the humblest of men—my creatures, my subjects; not to be served by them; you ought to dismiss these low and grovelling views of greatness. My example (not the example of the princes of the Gentiles) is worthy of your

imitation and love" (John xiii. 15). His works of beneficence they had witnessed in many forms, which they would have been well prepared to appreciate, could they have conceived adequately of the majesty and glory of his nature. One service, however, greater than all, and inconceivable to them, yet remained; it was his sacrificial work, to which he referred by the last words of this verse—"even to give his life a ransom for many." (See Rom. v. 7, 8; John x. 11.) Upon this clause we add a few observations.

The act of giving or offering his life as a ransom, our Lord predicates of himself as Son of Man. It was an act appropriate in its nature only to the priestly office. It follows, therefore, that as Son of Man he ever has been a priest as well as a king. It was shown in a former note (Matt. xvii. 22, 23) that as the King and Lord of Nature he was its Pontiff—his sovereignty and priesthood being commensurate and inseparable. His relation, as the Son of Man, to this world, as its king and universal Lord, is most explicitly taught in various forms (Ps. viii. 6, 7, 8; Matt. xiii. 41; xvi. 27, 28; xix. 28; xxv. 31–46; John v. 27; Acts xvii. 31; Rev. i. 13; Dan. vii. 13, 14). His dominion is, in the fullest sense, "an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." When he shall enter upon it in outward glory (see 1 Tim. vi. 15), according to this prediction of Daniel, Satan shall have no power again to mar it,—all that is offensive to Divine purity in the whole earth shall be expelled from it (Matt. xiii. 41). All his enemies (including the powers of darkness as well as rebellious men) will have been subjected to him (Matt. xxii. 44; Ps. cx.)—the curse, and all the evils it has entailed cast out (Rev. xxi. 3–5), and all things restored to a beauty and glory transcending that in which they were at first created. Over the new world, the Son of Man, as the second Adam, will exercise eternal dominion. The means by which this ineffably glorious result is now being wrought out are his sacrificial work as the Son of Man, the universal Pontiff, and Lord of Nature.

If we consider, in connexion with these two functions, his attributes of wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, we shall best approximate a proper conception of the King of Righteousness and King of Peace (Is. ix. 6, 7), whom

Paul describes in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of his epistle to the Hebrews. By interpreting the names MELCHIZEDEC, MELECHSALEM (Gen. xiv. 18), the apostle intimated that the principal thing to be regarded was, their signification; and of whom, we may now inquire, can the description he gives us of that great personage who met Abraham be predicated but the Son of Man? (See the notes on Matt. ix. 4, 25–27; xii. 2, 43–45, 46–50; xiii. 37–43; xiv. 18–21, 22, 23, 32; xvi. 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 27, 28; xvii. 2, 9, 22, 23, 27; xviii. 11.) Consider:

(1.) He was without father, without mother, without descent (or any earthly genealogy), having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God. This is said of him, as we conceive, not as the seed of the woman nor as the seed of Abraham, nor as the seed of David (Gen. iii. 15; Matt. i. 1), but as the Son of Man, the second man, the last Adam, the Lord from heaven (1 Cor. xv. 45–49). As the seed of the woman, the son of David, the son of Abraham, his genealogy is given (Luke iii. 23–38; Matt. i. 1–16), but as the second Adam, the man of the ever-

priesthood is, that men who are made priests according to that order, die; which could not be affirmed of Melchizedec and his order, for he continueth for ever, and his priesthood is unchangeable, that is, does not pass from one person to another (Heb. vii. 23, 24).

What man, having an earthly, or human genealogy, could be a priest of this order but the promised seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, of Judah, of David, Jesus the son of Joseph? Now the apostle is careful to remark (Heb. vii. 14) that of the tribe of Judah Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood, and consequently no man of that tribe could be a priest according to the order of Aaron (see Heb. viii. 4). But the Son of Man—the Heir, the Lord, the Pontiff of the world—having become incarnate in the tribe of Judah, in fulfilment of God's covenant with David (see note on Matt. ix. 4), in order that he might have somewhat (viz. the body of flesh which he took) to offer (Heb. viii. 3, x. 5), fulfilled his own proper office of priest according to the order of his higher relations as Son of Man; that is to say, as the Christ, the covenanted seed of David, he exercised a priesthood above the order of his incarnate relations to the race, and according to his relations to the world from its creation, as Son of Man. It was this which constituted him a priest according to the order of Melchizedec. This could not be, if Melchizedec had been any other than the Son of man. For if Melchizedec were a mortal man, then he could not have had that which is essential to his own order, for which our Lord was denominated a priest after his order; but if an immortal man, then he could be no other than the Son of Man.

(3) Again; if the priesthood of Melchizedec be perpetual, and Melchizedec himself a priest (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, Heb. vii. 3) for ever, then our Lord as Son of Man was Melchizedec; otherwise it would follow that there are two perpetual priesthoods or a succession of one priest to another in that priesthood, or two priests at the same time in the same office, either of which is impossible. And if it be essential to the order of Melchizedec that the priest should intercede within the veil, then the Son of Man, in the person of Jesus, must be the Melchizedec of whom Moses, and David, and Paul wrote; or there would be two intercessors within the

veil, which is contrary to the Scriptures; for none but Jesus ever did or ever will intercede within the veil. It may be added that the similitude between the priesthood of Christ and that of Melchizedec, pointed out by David in the 110th Psalm, has respect to the perpetuity and eternity of the latter. Hence, again, we infer that Melchizedec and the Son of Man were one and the same person, only under different manifestations and dispensations.

(4) If we may translate Heb. vii. 1 (ουτος γαρ ὁ Μελχισεδεκ) by the same rule the translators of our version observed in rendering Heb. viii. 10 (οτι αυτη ἡ διαθηκη) "for this *is* the covenant," etc., we get a direct solution of the apostle's meaning; for the verse would then be read thus: "For this"—referring to Jesus, the forerunner, in the preceding verse—"*is* the Melchizedec (king of righteousness), king of Salem (king of peace), priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him."*

In this manner Erasmus (no mean authority) interpreted the verse—"Nam hic erat Melchizedec rex Salem, Ponti-

The clause of the verse (28th) upon which these observations are founded may then be paraphrased thus: "Even as the Son of Man, the true Melchizedec, came forth from the Father and came into the world (John xvi. 28) and took unto himself a body in the seed of Abraham (Heb. ii. 16), in order that he might, as a priest of his own order, offer it up on the cross as a sacrifice, a ransom for many."

This was the end for which he came; for although at first he came to the nation of Israel as Messiah, and preached the kingdom to them that they might receive him in that character as their king; yet it was foreseen that the nation would reject him, as they virtually did when they rejected John the Baptist, and from that time forth he ministered to those who would receive him as the Son of Man and Saviour, and at the appointed time laid down his life a ransom for many of that people and for the redemption of the world, which was by inheritance his own.*

Matt. xxi. 1–11. The triumphal entry of our Lord into Jerusalem was a remarkable event. Nothing like it had occurred before. It was at variance with his previous life (see Matt. xii. 19), and it must have greatly perplexed the priests and pharisees who had already resolved to put him to death (John xi. 53). John gives us precisely the date of it in reference to the approaching passover. By comparing John xii. 1 and 12, it appears to have taken place on the fifth day before that festival, and according to our reckoning on Sunday (the Sunday following being the day of his resurrection). The interval was thickly crowded with the most wonderful events the world has ever witnessed. The history of these events, and the public and private discourses our Lord delivered during that short space of time, occupy the last eight chapters of this gospel. The space allotted by

---

spects this author thinks he was superior to Abraham, but in other respects inferior. The discussion is elaborate, but does not remove the difficulties that attend every hypothesis, which assumes an earthly although unknown genealogy of Melchizedec.

* In Rev. v. 10, the redeemed are represented as praising the Lamb because he had made them kings and *priests* unto God; and in Rev. xx. 6, it is declared, that those who have part in the *first* resurrection shall be *priests* of God and of Christ (see 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9). Did it ever occur to the reader to inquire of what order their priesthood will be? (See John xvii. 22; Phil. iv. 21; 1 John iii. 2; Heb. ii. 11).

each of the evangelists* to the closing week of our Lord's ministry, compared with that allotted to the preceding part of it, shows not only the transcendent importance of its events, but the deep interest which they felt in them.

But there is another view in which we should consider this occurrence. In the preceding notes the reader's attention has been called to the majesty and glory of our Lord's nature as a man, his wonderful attributes of wisdom and power, and his dominion over all physical and spiritual natures. That such a being should accept a triumph whose crowning glory was the hosannas of children, shows his great condescension, and justifies the conclusion that there was a much deeper meaning in the transaction than those who witnessed it discerned. Matthew alleges expressly, that this entry of our Lord into Jerusalem, and the manner of it, were a fulfilment of prophecy (Zech. ix. 9), and so does John (xii. 15). It was a sign by which Jerusalem might know her king; and however minute or trivial it might appear to the careless and worldly Jews, it must be fulfilled (John xix. 28, x. 35). He was the king—God; king over the

titude (Matt. xxi. 8), greater, perhaps, than ever before, who were going up to the approaching festival. From Bethphage he sent two of his disciples to a village not named by either evangelist, but quite near, and, perhaps, in sight, giving them a direction which evinced both his knowledge and his power.

Verse 2. "And straightway (ευθεως, readily, without seeking) ye shall find an ass *tied*, and a colt with her," "whereon never man sat" (Mark xi. 2; Luke xix. 30).

This direction may remind the reader of that he gave to Peter respecting the tribute money (Matt. xvii. 27), and of another he soon afterwards gave to the two disciples he sent to prepare the passover (Mark xiv. 12–16; Luke xxii. 8–10). Nor can we regard the words "whereon never man sat," as unimportant. They are the words of the Saviour, and two of the evangelists carefully note them. Their design, perhaps, was to show the submissiveness of the untrained animal to the Saviour's will, and, in this view, it may be classed with the miracle wrought for the payment of the tribute money (Matt. xvii. 27), and thus be intended as a further exemplification of the dominion ascribed to him in the 8th Psalm.

Verse 3. "And if any one say aught to you, ye shall say, the Lord hath need of them, and straightway he will send them."

What the Saviour anticipated, we learn from Mark (xi. 5) and Luke (xix. 33), occurred. The owners (Luke xix. 33) observing the unceremonious manner in which their property was about to be taken, interposed: "Why loose ye the colt?" The motive for this question is not explained. Whether they apprehended trouble or danger from untying the colt, or merely regarded the act as an improper interference with their rights, we can only conjecture. Bengel supposes that the owners were devoted friends of the Lord Jesus. But of this there is no evidence. We suppose that they would as readily have consented if they had been strangers, or even enemies to him. It seems much more probable that the recording of this circumstance was designed to show the power of the Saviour's will; and thus considered, it may remind the reader again of Mark xiv. 14, 15; and Luke xxii. 8–10. Besides, the title which he assumed, and bade his messengers declare—THE LORD—

הָאָדוֹן seems to have respect to his universal headship over the earth, as Son of Man, rather than to the special relation he bore to his disciples and familiar friends. (See John xiii. 13.) We may add, that the fulfilment of prophecy finds neither impediments in the opposition of enemies, nor assistance from the favor of friends. If we may adopt this view as the true one, we have in this chapter three notable examples of the power of the Saviour's will (see vs. 2, 3, 19), as well as a direct reference (vs. 16) to the 8th Psalm, in which his dominion, also as Son of Man, over created natures, is described. (See notes on Matt. viii. 28–32.)

But we must not leave this passage without noticing the majesty of the expression, "The Lord hath need of them." As if he had said: The son of man—the Lord of the world, requires their services, not for his own ease or convenience (for we do not read that he rode at any other time during his public ministry) but for the fulfilment of prophecy, as we are informed in the next verses.

Neither Mark nor Luke quotes this or any other prophecy as having been fulfilled on this occasion; and John omits the circumstance of the Saviour's sending two disciples to the village, and the directions he gave them. He says, however, that none of them understood at that time the meaning of the transaction; but after "Jesus was glorified then remembered they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him." Yet the prophecy is unambiguous, and by thus fulfilling it the Lord virtually assumed the character of Zion's king. It was an overt act or claim of sovereignty much more significant than any which the chief priests alleged against him before Pilate (Luke xxiii. 2). It was an answer also to the demand of his authority which the priests and elders made on the day following in the temple (vs. 23), which they might have perceived, had they remembered the prophecy and understood it.

Verse 8. "And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way, and others cut down branches from the trees and strewed them in the way."

It appears by John (xii. 12–13), that the multitudes which attended him on this occasion, in part at least, came out from Jerusalem to meet him, for the news of his coming had reached the city. These joined the multitudes which had followed from Jericho (xx. 31). It was a vast concourse, which agitated (σεσείσθη, vs. 10) and aroused the whole city. The universal inquiry was, who is this?

The spreading of their garments and the strewing of branches in the way, were tokens of submission to him, as their lawful king (2 Kings ix. 13). It was done (κατ' οἰκονομίαν) as a part of the customary ceremonial of a new accession to the throne.

Verse 9. "And the multitudes that went before and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David;

---

proper meaning of the prophet, the evangelist Matthew differs from the others chiefly in being more particular; for the purpose, it may be presumed, of showing how minutely our Lord's conduct, on this occasion, corresponded with the words of the prophecy. He took care that nothing should be wanting to the sign or proof which he was now about to exhibit to the nation, that he was the king in whom the prophet bade them to rejoice greatly (Zech. ix. 9).

Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest."

By this acclamation they indicated that a king of David's race had commenced his reign; an event which was looked for by all, and was most grateful to their desires. The word hosanna was an invocation of his royal aid and clemency (2 Sam. xiv. 4; Σῶσον ὁ βασιλεὺς, σῶσον, LXX.; Serva me, Rex, Vulg.; הוֹשִׁיעָה, Heb. See also Ps. cxviii. 25, from which this acclamation appears to have been adopted), as if they had said: "Hosanna to thee, O Son of David; Hosanna to Him who is in the highest heavens (Ὡσαννα δοξα τῷ εν ὑψίστοις θεῷ)."

We learn from Luke (xix. 27), that the acclamation commenced at the descent of the Mount of Olives, and from Matthew (xxi. 15), that it was continued until after he had entered the temple. The Pharisees, who were displeased (Luke xix. 39), regarded this demonstration of the popular favor as a sure indication of his success (John xii. 19); from which we may infer the impressiveness of the scene

universal and sincere, the overflowings of holy hearts, he would at that time have established his kingdom over them (Luke xix. 41–44; Matt. xxiii. 37). But they were not such; rather were they the homage of depraved natures—a homage, nevertheless, which must needs be rendered, that the prediction of the prophet might be fulfilled (vs. 4).

To this occasion, and the events which soon followed, the second Psalm undoubtedly refers (Acts iv. 24–28; xiii. 33). The sixth verse refers especially to this occasion, yet only provisionally or conditionally: "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion" [or more literally, "And I have anointed my King over Zion, the mountain of my holiness."]

Jesus, the Son of Man, Jehovah's King over the whole earth, was advancing to Mount Zion to take possession of the throne of David, and to confirm, at that time, the promises unto the fathers (Rom. xv. 8), if their children would receive him with a loving and obedient spirit.

Luke xix. 41–44. "And when he was come near, he looked on the city and wept over it."

The word (εκλαυσε) translated *wept*, implies, says Dr. Robinson, "not only the shedding of tears, but every external expression of grief." It is a more intensive word than (εδακρυσε) that is translated *wept* in John xi. 35. The passage proves, that as a man, our Lord felt more deeply for the doomed city and its inhabitants than any other man could feel; for no other man could have so vivid an apprehension of the awful judgments which their foreseen and guilty rejection of him would bring upon them. (See Luke xxiii. 27–31, and notes on those verses, Journ. vol. ix. 465–469.) But notice also the contrasts: He was entering the city with triumphal displays, amidst the shoutings and rejoicings of myriads, in the manner foretold by the prophet, yet lamenting aloud—a circumstance not plainly expressed by the prophet, yet implied perhaps in the word עני (*ani.* See Deut. xvi. 3; Prov. xxxi. 5; Gen. xvi. 11; xli. 52), which the LXX. in this place render πραυς,—a rendering which the evangelist adopts. We do not suppose the word *necessarily* implies the shedding of tears, because the evangelist adds, by way of explanation:—

Luke xix. 42. "Saying, If thou hadst known, even thou

at least, in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace! But now they are hidden from thine eyes."

This verse may be rendered: "Oh! that thou hadst known, even thou also"—alluding, perhaps, to his disciples, who acknowledged him with hearty good will—"the things that make for thy peace, in this thy day!"—meaning, perhaps, that very day of his entry into Jerusalem, as her rightful king, which was a day altogether extraordinary. (Ps. cxviii. 24.) "But now they are hidden from thine eyes." (See Bengel's Gnom.)

By the rejection of John the Baptist, the nation virtually rejected the Lord Jesus, and the kingdom he offered them. (See notes on Matt. xiv. 10, Journ. vol. xi. 390–392.) By the just judgment of God, therefore, the condition of the nation, *as such*, was changed. Judicial blindness had come over the people nationally. The ministry of the Lord, as has been remarked, had also been from that time changed, and his labors directed to other ends, viz. to the saving of those who would receive him with the obedience of faith (John i. 11, 12). Yet no one who considers this verse with

King and Lord. But who would have put him to death, if his people had received him? In the providence of God, the chosen people had become subject to Gentile power; and Ps. ii. 1, 2; Acts iv. 25–27, may cast some light upon this subject. Still the question is speculative, and ought not to be pressed. Of one thing, however, we are sure, that the Divine power and wisdom can never want expedients to accomplish all the Divine purposes, under all supposable or possible contingencies and emergencies.

We are justified, therefore, in considering the scheme of the Divine procedure towards Israel (the elect nation), and the world at large, as framed with a double aspect: that is, as having respect to what God would do, whether Israel would keep or break the terms of the covenant. If Israel would obey and keep the covenant, then they should be a peculiar people, a kingdom of priests. This is expressly declared, Exod. xix. 5, 6. They should be exalted to thrones of celestial glory, and be for ever with the Lord, and not only behold the glory of their king, but be sharers in it and his throne. The nations of the earth, from that time forth, would have been subject to their rule. But if, on the other hand, they should disobey and break the covenant, as it was foreseen they would, then the promised kingdom should be taken from them, and given to another people, to be chosen of God, and called and collected in such manner and at such times as He should see fit (Matt. xxi. 43, xxii. 8, 9, 11–13; Luke xiv. 24; 1 Pet. ii. 9; and see notes on Matt. xvii. 22, 23).

Luke xix. 43, 44. "For the days will come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee, and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another, because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation."

This prophecy was pronounced as the Lord Jesus was about to enter the city as its king. It was repeated more in detail to four of the disciples upon the mount, from which he was then descending, two days afterwards (Luke chap. xxi., Matt. chap. xxiv., Mark chap. xiii.), and the same calamities he alluded to again, when bearing his cross to Calvary (Luke xxiii. 29). The true cause of them is as-

signed in the last clause of these verses. The nation "knew not the time of its visitation," words which correspond to the 42d verse. The time had come when the peace of the nation must be established under his rule, or the nation itself must be given over to the power of its enemies. He would have gathered and protected them with the most affectionate care (Matt. xxiii. 37; Ps. lxxxi. 13–16), but they would not be gathered. The fault was theirs. The Saviour had exhibited to them all the appointed proofs of his Messiahship. The manner of his entry into the city at that time was a prophetical sign of his royal character, and claim to their allegiance. Had it been possible for them to receive him with the obedience of faith, and had they done so, "he would have soon subdued their enemies, and turned his hand against their adversaries. The haters of the Lord should have submitted themselves to him, but their time should have endured for ever" (Ps. lxxxi. 14, 15).

Matt. xxi. 10, 11. "And when he was come into Jerusalem all the city (the whole city) was moved (agitated, put in commotion), saying, Who is this? And the multitude said

Some harmonists refer this transaction to the next day (Monday, according to our reckoning), in order to reconcile Matthew with Mark. Others suppose, that it was repeated on the next day, as Mark relates, with this additional restraint, that he would not suffer any one to carry a vessel through the temple (Mark xi. 16). According to this hypothesis, the Lord drove out of the temple the money-changers thrice, viz. once before he entered upon his public ministry, while John was still baptizing (John ii. 13–17), and twice just before the close of it.

Without entering into a formal discussion of the question, the writer adopts this view of the matter, as it appears to be both reasonable and natural. Another question has been made, whether the action was miraculous or simply natural. Upon this, we remark, that the transaction was in harmony with the other acts of our Lord on that occasion. He had, in the fulfilment of prophecy (Zech. ix. 9), temporarily assumed his character of king of Zion. Entering the city as her king, in the manner foretold, he proceeded to the temple and entered it also in that character. This is evident from the hosannas which he there received in despite of the remonstrances of the priests and scribes (vs. 15). All felt his presence and the mysterious power of his will. His works in the temple on that occasion, were (θαυμάσια) wonderful—wonderful, as we suppose, in comparison with any he had exhibited on other occasions (vs. 15). For a little space, he acted as king, though (πραὺς) meekly or mildly, in comparison with the powers he will exert when he shall sit on the throne of his glory (Matt. xxv. 31, 32). It was in keeping with the occasion, and indeed it was required by the prophecy he was fulfilling, that he should do so. This view is confirmed by the next verse.

Matt. xxi. 13. "And he said to them it is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." (Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46.)

He claims the temple as his own—his house: his, by Divine right, as king of Zion (see Matt. xii. 6). In that character and by that right, he expelled, not by a scourge of cords (John ii. 15), but by force of his will, those who polluted it. These words must have been understood by those who heard them as an assumption of personal autho-

rity over the temple, and of the right to overrule the authority of the priests. Therefore it was, that on the next day the priests and the elders made a formal demand of his authority, and whence he derived it (vs. 23), seeing the guardianship and the use of the temple was by the law and the constitution of their commonwealth especially committed to them. It is natural to suppose that this demand was made officially, and after a formal consultation; which the exciting events of the preceding day did not allow them to hold. The reader will observe, also, that their demand did not turn upon his miracles of healing (vs. 14) or upon his teaching (see Matt. xxii. 16), (for these they did not regard as an invasion of their authority), but upon his other acts on that occasion.

Verses 15, 16. "And when the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful things (θαυμασια the wonders) he did, and the children crying in the temple and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David, they were sore displeased (indignant), and said to him, Hearest thou what these say?"

This question of the priests and scribes, shows the chief

the Son of Man in the Son of David; for on the same day, and perhaps in the temple on the same occasion, his discourse concerning himself as the Son of Man (John xii. 23–34) prompted the people to inquire, "Who is this Son of Man? (vs. 34). The Christ," said they, "abideth for ever. This we have heard out of the law: but thou sayest, the Son of Man must be lifted up." The seemingly opposite destinies of these two persons, as declared by the law, and by himself, proved to the apprehension of the people that they could not be the same person. This inquiry of the people was not made in a sceptical spirit, for they regarded him as a prophet and were very attentive to hear him (Luke xix. 48; Mark xi. 18; Matt. xxi. 48). That the Son of Man was not an ordinary man was apparent from the whole tenor of our Lord's discourse; especially from (vs. 23) the glory claimed for him, attested as the claim was, by a miraculous voice (vs. 28, 29). This they must have understood: but who could he be? They had not heard of him as they had of the Christ, out of the law. It is significant that our Lord did not answer the inquiry. It proves, that there was a mystery in the matter, which it did not belong to his mission to explain. (Comp. vs. 34 and 35.)

The view the writer takes of the question, will be apparent to those who have considered the preceding notes. As the (Adon or) Lord of the world, he became incarnate in the line of David. It was this purpose which excited the amazement of David. (See note on Matt. ix. 4, vol. xi. 207, 211; Matt. xvi. 13, 14, 16, vol. xi. 411–416). As the seed of David, he was also king of Zion. On the ground of this distinction, we account for the discriminative words of Ps. ii. 6: "Yet have I set my king," that is, my king of the whole earth, "upon Zion, the mountain of my holiness." He had now come in fulfilment of prophecy (Zech. ix. 9) meekly, yet authoritatively to take possession of his kingdom and of his temple for a brief space, and then voluntarily to offer up his body as a ransom for the world, of which, as the Son of Man, he was the Lord (John xii. 24). Considering his foreseen rejection as Messiah, this was the great end of his incarnation and mission; and that was the mystery which the question of the people touched upon. Our Lord's answer was in effect: "Use well the light you have, while you have

it, without inquiring into matters which do not especially concern you at this time (vs. 35, 36).

Matt. xxi. 17. "And he left them and went out of the city into [to] Bethany, and lodged there."

According to the harmonists, our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and the transactions in the temple which we have considered, occurred on Sunday, or five days before the passover. It does not appear that he lodged in the city any night afterwards. He went either to Bethany (Mark xi. 12) or to the Mount of Olives (Luke xxi. 37, 38; Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26; Luke xxii. 39) or to the garden of Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 36), or to some other place out of the city (Mark xi. 19). Are we to regard this conduct as a precaution, designed to guard by natural means against his apprehension before the appointed time (see John x. 39, and note on Matt. ii. 12, 13), or a part of the arrangement by which the punctual fulfilment of the prophecies was to be accomplished (see John xviii. 2; Acts i. 16), or both? However we may resolve these questions, it is evident, the rulers

The miracle recorded in these verses was witnessed only by our Lord's disciples (Mark xi. 14). It was wrought apparently for the purpose of conveying to them the instruction contained in the next two verses (vs. 21, 22). If we regard the tree as a symbol of the nation, and the malediction as indicative of the nation's doom, until the end of this dispensation, the *time* of the act may be significant. Our Lord had entered Jerusalem, the day before, as her king, but he was not received in that character, except by the children. The multitudes hailed him only as the prophet of Nazareth, while the rulers plotted against his life (John xii. 36). With that day, therefore, the day of their national visitation ended, and before he entered the city again, he portrayed in the fig-tree the nation's doom. The parable of the fig-tree, in Luke xiii. 6–10, at least favors the symbolical interpretation of this miracle, although we cannot, as before intimated, find ground for such an interpretation in the context. (See Matt. xxi. 42, 43.) Nor is it probable the disciples, at that time, saw more in the miracle than an exhibition of power which the Saviour taught them they would be able to exercise through faith in him; and thus considered, we understand in the literal sense the following verse:—

Verse 21. "Verily I say unto you, if ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this, which is done to the fig-tree, but also if ye shall say to this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done." (See Mark xi. 22, 23.)

This is teaching by example; a method which excludes hyperbole. Yet, as before intimated, the promise has respect to the glorified elect in the world to come. (See notes on Matt. xiv. 30, 31; John xiv. 12, vol. viii. 100–103.) If, indeed, we assume that our Lord, in this promise, had respect to his believing people in this world, then it must be confessed it has never been realized even in the holiest of men (1 Cor. xiii. 2), and we feel constrained by the fact to divest it of its proper literal meaning. What our Lord *added* to these words, however, may be intended to describe the power of faith in this life.

Verse 28. "And all things whatsoever ye shall ask *in prayer*, believing, ye shall receive."

Here prayer is added to faith, as a means to the end. On a former occasion (Matt. xvii. 21, see note) he prescribed *fasting* as well as prayer, but in that case, with reference to their exercise of *miraculous* powers in this life. But in this verse the Saviour seems to speak only of believing prayer; and thus understood, there is no reason why we should confine the promise to the apostles, any more than we should the injunction to forgive, which Mark adds (xi. 25). The promise of our Lord, thus interpreted, extends to the whole futurity of the believer's being,—to his state of humility and suffering in this life, and to his state of glory in the ages to come. We may add, the largeness of our Lord's conceptions, including, as they ever did, his whole work, favors this interpretation. All his promises to his elect took hold of unfathomable mysteries.

Matt. xxi. 23–xxv. 46.

The matters recorded by this evangelist, beginning at this place, and ending with chapter xxiii., are commonly supposed to have occurred on [Tuesday] the third day before the passover. Our Lord's prophecy of the destruc-

affected by the hosannas which had been offered him. But not to dwell on these circumstantial notices, we remark that the reader will not appreciate the sublimity of this portion of the gospel without a profound sense of the majesty of our Lord's person, and the solemnity of the crisis the nation had reached. It was the last day of our Lord's public ministry. Several hours before the close of it, and we doubt not, before the hour of evening prayer, he took his final leave of the temple, declaring it left desolate. The death of John the Baptist, we have seen, was an epoch in the nation's history. It marked their near approximation to the verge of destruction, and their certain downfall. (See note on Matt. xiv. 6–9). Now the crisis had come. In an important sense it was the nation's day of judgment. For although the Lord did not enter the temple on that day officially to judge the nation, yet he entered it to pronounce words of reprobation and punishment, by commandment of the Father, which, in the course of Divine Providence, were soon to be put in execution, with fearful and prolonged effect (Luke xxi. 22). Accordingly, the language he employed was positive, direct, and judicially denunciatory.

We must not regard the words he uttered as the language of strife or invective, nor his responses to his assailants as an exhibition of dialectic skill. This would be a low view, infinitely beneath the dignity and majesty of his character, and quite at variance with the solemn function he was performing. He was the Son of Man, and the rightful Lord of the world. He was the Christ, and in that relation the King of Israel. He was the Minister of God the Father, performing, by Divine command, the last public, official act of his ministry (John xii. 49, 50). A tone of authority, power, and majesty pervades all his sayings on that day, and his words did but convey to them God's reasons for the fearful calamities he was about to send upon the nation. We return now to the text:—

Verse 23. "And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?"

Our Lord left Bethany (πρωΐας) early in the morning (vs. 18). The impression his preaching had made on the people

was very deep (Luke xix. 48). In the expressive language of Luke (εξεκρεματο) they hung upon him, and assembled very early (ωρθριζε, Luke xxi. 38) to hear him. We may reasonably suppose he had been engaged a considerable time in teaching, before the dignitaries of the nation appeared at the temple, with their demand, which seems to have been officially made. The motive for making it may have been, in part, at least, to counteract his influence with the people, which they greatly feared (xxvi. 5; John xii. 19)—and if so, they would be likely to make it with a stately show of their own authority, to impress the people, and perhaps also with the vain conceit of producing awe in the mind of Jesus. However this may be, the demand interrupted his discourse to the people, and drew their attention to his discourse with the priests and elders which followed. It was a new step upon the part of the rulers, and calculated to create the apprehension that it would be followed by violence. According to Mark's account (which doubtless is accurate), on this occasion also our Lord drove out of the temple the traders and money-changers. There is

have been but repeating what he had often told them before, and what they had rejected as sufficient proof of his Divine mission. They regarded them, or affected to regard them, in another light. Hence, our Lord replied by asking them another question.

Verse 24. "And Jesus answered and said unto them: I also will ask you one thing, which if ye will tell me, I in likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things."

As if he had said: Seeing you judge, that my works, performed in your presence, do not prove my authority to do these things, nor show whence I derive it, I also will ask you one thing, your answer to which will prove, whether you can be convinced of my authority, by any evidence, which God has seen proper to give you upon that question: For other or greater evidence you cannot have.

Verse 25. "The baptism of John: whence was it? From heaven or from men?"

The reader must remember that the whole evidence which God saw proper to give the Jews of the Divine mission of the Lord Jesus was comprised in the ministry or baptism of John, and his own ministry, especially his miraculous works. This has been sufficiently shown in the foregoing notes. Especially did our Lord rely upon his works, placing them not only above the testimony of John, but his own words (John v. 30–37, xv. 24). No other signs from heaven of his authority were consistent with the Divine plan (Matt. xvi. 1–4, and see note on Matt. xii. 48, vol. xi. pp. 242, 244). It is obvious, therefore, that if the questioners were not convinced by the miracles of the Lord (and their question, as we have said, assumes that they were not), the only remaining source of proof was the ministry or baptism of John. This, though inferior evidence to miracles, was in its nature and power a sufficient attestation of the Divine mission of Jesus. (See note on Matt. iii. 1, 2, xi. 3, vol. xi. 71, 84, 85, 90, 91, 226, 227.)

Some commentators suppose that the turn which our Lord gave to the question of the priests and elders was designed to put them in a strait between their malice and their fears—an effect which it had. But the motive of the Saviour, as we conceive, lay deeper. *His* question was pertinent to *their* question—their question being considered

with reference to the only evidence upon which it could possibly be resolved. It was designed to prove out of their own mouth that neither the testimony of John, nor his own wonderful works could convince them; and without these, his own verbal declaration of his authority would be, even in his own view, of no avail (John v. 31, xiv. 11, xv. 24).

Verses 25, 26. "And they reasoned with themselves saying, If we shall say from heaven, he will say, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, from men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet."

Some, perhaps most readers take it for granted, the Saviour would have replied as the priests and elders surmised he would, if they had answered his question truly. By such a reply they would no doubt have publicly convicted themselves of enormous guilt, but it is by no means certain that his answer to them would have been such as they imagined. Certainly he would have fulfilled his promise, and shown them his authority, and perhaps have

out a heavenly warrant, it would prove that the evidence of John's authority was ineffectual to produce conviction in their minds, as the miracles of the Lord Jesus were; and also, that their unbelief and obduracy were insurmountable by the combined force of all the evidence God had seen proper to give them.

Verse 27. "And he said unto them, neither tell * I you, by what authority I do these things."

Our Lord knew their thoughts and answered them according to their intent, and not according to their words. He assumed, however, the Divine authority of John's mission, as well as his own; which in effect he connected together as one in purpose and intent (so far as they respected the nation) by his question. The admission or denial of John's authority was in effect the admission or denial of his own (John v. 33, 36), and a doubt concerning either, was a doubt which could not be removed by additional evidence: Hence the appositeness of the reply.

Verses 28–31. Having thus disposed of the question proposed to him by the chief priests and elders, our Lord put to them a hypothetical case taken from common life, upon which he framed another question in such terms, that it could receive only one answer. "But what think ye?"—What would be your opinion in this case? "A man had two sons, and going to the first he said, Son, go work today in my vineyard. He answered and said I will not; but afterwards he repented and went. Then going to the second, he said (likewise) the same. "And he answered and said, I go, sir, but went not. Which of the two *did* the will of the father?"

This case was put with tacit reference to the Jewish people considered under two divisions—the rulers and the ruled—the priests, pharisees, lawyers (Luke vii. 29, 30), and the learned on the one hand, and the common people, including the lowest and most despised classes of them, on the other (John vii. 45–49). The former were, by outward profession, the servants of God, and the acknowledged ministers of his religion—the teachers and guides of all

* An old commentator notes on this verse; *ουκ ἔιπεν, ουκ οἶδα, ἀλλ', ου λεγω—αντὶ τοῦ ουκ ἠβουλήθητέ τὸ ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν.*

classes of the common people (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3). Upon all questions of religious worship and duty, their decisions were authoritative and decisive. The appearance and public ministry of John the Baptist, were extraordinary and startling events. They were so regarded by all. He summoned the nation to a new baptism, which was a religious rite, well known to them. But by what authority? That was the great question. The priests, rulers, and teachers of the people claimed the right to decide it, as they did other questions connected with religion; and the masses of the people, it is probable, would have easily acquiesced in their decision had not John's authority been authenticated by the most ample and convincing proofs (See note on Matt. iii. 1). The rulers did decide the question, but the people almost universally (Luke iii. 21, Matt. iii. 5. 6) rejected unhesitatingly and strongly their decision, and as a proof of their sincerity sought him and submitted to his baptism.

But the contrast which our Lord intended to make was

had had ample opportunity to consider those proofs, notwithstanding your large professions of obedience—"repented not that ye might believe in him." Therefore "publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

On this occasion, our Lord referred for the last time, so far as we know, to the ministry of John the Baptist; and the reader will observe he does so in connexion with his own. As on a former occasion (see Matt. xi. 10–14 and notes), so now, he bears the strongest testimony to John's authority. Then, indeed, John, though imprisoned, was in their midst. It was not too late *then* for the nation to receive him. But now he speaks of John's ministry as a bygone matter, as an opportunity neglected and gone beyond recall. The rejection of John, we have seen, was in effect the rejection of the Lord himself (see note on Matt. xiv. 10), and so he treated it, as appears by the next parable (vs. 33–39). All questions, therefore, touching his authority or the authority of John came too late. No answer could have served any interest which they had at stake. By employing the words we are considering, our Lord assumed that the day of national visitation was over, and the hope of Israel, *as a nation*, gone for that time. The only hope of salvation that remained was individual and personal, which might be entertained by some on better grounds than by others. But of all classes the priests and the rulers had the least reason to expect the divine favor, less even than publicans and harlots. In this truth, thus plainly declared (not in anger or invective, but as the divine estimation (John xii. 48, 49) of their character and condition, the severity of the comparison consisted.

Having told the dignitaries of the nation, in the plainest language, their true character and condition in the sight of God, our Lord passes immediately to the nation itself. The transition was easy and natural. In all their generations, from the commencement of their covenant-relations as the elect people of God, the governing powers of the nation had been corrupt and rebellious. It was only through the mercy and forbearance of God that it had been reserved to that generation to fill up the measure of their national sins (see Matt. xxiii. 30–32). With equal plainness, therefore,

our Lord proceeds to pronounce the nation's punishment, which (so far as declared on this occasion) consisted chiefly in the deprivation of the privileges contained in the covenant of the kingdom (vs. 43). This is the drift or general import of the parable of the vineyard (vs. 33–41). The loss, of necessity, fell upon the people composing the nation, and it came upon them mediately, or instrumentally, through their rulers, yet not without individual participation in the national sins. The people, in all their generations, had concurred in, or assented to, the sins of their rulers, and oftentimes instigated them; although, in the matter of John the Baptist's ministry, their guilt did not consist in concurring with their rulers, but in their not receiving him with the obedience of faith (see note on Matt. xi. 14). This lack of faith was a sinful defect, and the cause of their similar treatment of the Lord himself. We have seen that, from the death of John the Baptist, our Lord changed his public ministry from the nation, in its public capacity, to the people in their individual and personal relations. He offered

jects, or as individuals responsible for their personal sins. They are the last our Lord publicly delivered, and explain the reasons of the dreadful judgments which were soon to be sent upon them. These observations premised, we proceed with the exposition.

Verses 33–41. *The parable of the Vineyard.*

This parable may remind the reader of Isaiah v. 1–8, from which the imagery of it was, perhaps, designedly borrowed. It is an allegory of God's dealings with Israel, from the time he entered into covenant with them, at Horeb (Exod. xix. 1–5), and of their conduct, as the people of the covenant, to the close of our Lord's ministry. But the chief or finishing stroke of the representation is designed to set forth the end of his own mission and the most atrocious and heaven-daring of the nation's sins. It does not come within the purpose of these notes to explain minutely the material circumstances of the parable, or to trace throughout the resemblance between the allegory and the historical events it compendiously represents. The moral or application of the parable is too obvious to be mistaken. The chief priests and Pharisees plainly perceived it. They could not fail to do so after our Lord had declared its import.

In general, it may be remarked that, by the mission of servants (vs. 34) we are to understand the raising up and sending of prophets to the people, which may be supposed to commence with Samuel (see Acts iii. 24), in the days of Eli (about 1130 B.C.), from whose days, till the return from the Captivity at Babylon (about 536 B.C.), the succession of prophets was almost, if not quite, uninterrupted.*

---

* The reader may satisfy himself of the correctness of this remark by referring to the following passages, according to Townsend's chronological arrangement of the O. T.: 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, 15, xxii. 5; 1 Chron. xxix. 29; 2 Chron. xxix. 25; 2 Sam. xxiv. 11–14; 1 Chron. xxi. 9–13; 2 Sam. vii. 2; 1 Kings i.; 1 Chron. ix. 29, xvii. 1; 2 Chron. xxix. 25, 29; 1 Kings iv. 5, xi. 29; 1 Chron. ix. 29; 2 Kings xiv. 2–4; 1 Kings xiii. 1, 11–18, 20–22, 26–32; 2 Chron. ix. 29, xii. 15, xiii. 22; 2 Kings xii. 22; 2 Chron. xi. 2, xii. 5, 7, 15, xv. 1–8, xvi. 7; 1 Kings xvi. 1, 7–12; 2 Chron. xix. 2, xx. 34; 1 Kings xvii. 1; 2 Kings i. 3; 2 Chron. xxi. 12–15; 1 Kings xiv. 25, xviii. 4, 13, 19–40, xix. 16, 19–22, xvi. 33, xx. 13–22, 28, 35, 41, xxii. 8; 2 Chron. xviii. 7; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5, 7, 9–15, 16, xiii. 14–25, iv. 1, 38, ix. 1–4; 2 Chron. xxiv. 20–22, xxv. 7, 15; Amos i. 1, vii. 9, 10, 11; Hos. i. 1; 2 Kings xviii. 10; Isaiah i, 1, vi. 1, vii. 1, xiv. 28, xx. 1, *xxxv. 1; 2 Kings xix. 2;* 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, 5, xxviii. 9; Mic. i. 1;

The book of Esther closes the canon of the Old Testament Scriptures. By whom it was written we do not know; but undoubtedly by an inspired person. After the close of the canon we have not so sure means of tracing the succession of heaven-sent messengers, but we have no reason to suppose that God, at any time, left the people without prophets, or wise men, or scribes who were faithful witnesses of his truth (see Matt. xxiii. 34) during the succeeding interval which was terminated by the appearance of John. Such witnesses (whatever their office or character) would be aptly represented by the servants of the parable.

Verse 37. "But last of all he sent his son, saying (certainly) they will reverence my son."

It cannot be necessary to remark that the son represents our blessed Lord himself. And when we consider the majesty of his person as the Son of Man, the Adam of the everlasting covenant—His divine wisdom and his wonderful works—His infinite superiority to the greatest of the prophets (Matt. iii. 11, xi. 11), there would be great reason to anticipate His favorable reception. The result of our Lord's

cedure even when considered according to the low standard of earthly analogies. It was with this view of the circumstance, as we conceive, the evangelist records the response of the people (vs. 41).*

Verse 39. "And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him" (see Luke xx. 15; Mk. xii. 8).

We incline to believe our Lord, in these words, had especial allusion to his approaching sufferings *without the city* (Heb. xiii. 12). There was a typical exigency for his suffering without the gate, which he might well represent in this circumstance of the parable. Mark, it is true, differs from the other evangelists in representing the husbandmen as first killing the son, and then casting him out of the vineyard; and perhaps we should account for this discrepancy (as we did for that just noticed) by supposing that the stress of the parable does not, in any degree, lie upon this circumstance. We prefer, however, another explanation. Mark wrote his gospel for the use of Gentile churches. It was not important to his purpose, nor was it his intention, as we suppose, to affirm the *order* of the events, or do more than specify the fact itself, which he does in substantial consistency with the record of Matthew. Either statement shows a contempt of the rights of the son, and equal indignity to his person, which was all that Mark intended to show. But Matthew wrote his gospel especially for the Hebrew Chris-

* There appears to be a discrepancy between the evangelists in this particular. Matthew ascribes the answer in vs. 41 to the people; Mark and Luke ascribe it to our Lord himself. We suppose both records are correct. Both answers may have been given, one by some of the bystanders, as Matthew relates, and the other by our Lord, as Mark and Luke relate, or our Lord may have adopted the answer of the bystanders, incorporating it, as he proceeded, into his own discourse. However this may be, the discrepancy proves that the stress of the passage does not lie on this circumstance. As uttered by our Lord, the words are prophetical. As used by the people they express merely the reasonableness of such punishment. It was mor important to Matthew's purpose to record the *popular* judgment upon tl case represented than the prophecy, because the prophecy involved in tl words, as used by our Lord, is supplied by another declaration in the forl third and forty-fourth verses, and also by the parable of the marriage, whi he proceeds immediately to record (Matt. xxii. 7). Whereas the other ev gelists omit the parable of the marriage, as well as the response of the standers, and our Lord's other declaration (recorded by Matthew in the fo third verse), substituting for all these the Saviour's declaration of the pur ment the Lord *of the vineyard would* inflict upon the husbandmen.

tians, who were more or less familiar with the typical signification of their ritual. On this assumption Paul reasons, in the passage just before cited from Heb. xiii. 11, 12. It was more important, therefore, for such readers to record with orderly exactness this part of the parable, knowing the use that would be made of it as an argument with that people. Hence we conclude that, while neither evangelist contradicts the other, the especial views with which they wrote satisfactorily account for the difference between them in this as well as many other particulars.

The reader will observe, that the crime of ejecting and killing the Son, is ascribed wholly to (the Jews) the husbandmen. In the Divine regard, they were the authors of it (though the Romans acted concurrently with the Jewish rulers), and so the apostle Peter charged it upon them (Acts ii. 23; iii. 17, 18; v 30). There was a needs-be, that the nation should disown his rights and their obligations before the Roman governor *could have* any power over him (John xix. 11, and see note on that verse). We observe also, the tranquillity with which our Lord vividly depicts his impending

in the Psalms: The stone that the builders rejected, as unworthy of a place in God's building, the same has become, in spite of them, the very head stone of the corner.

Substantially, the three evangelists agree; all of them narrate the quotation in connexion with the parable, and as expository of its meaning. Luke shows its particular connexion with what was said before. The seeming discrepancy arises from the different degrees of particularity observed by the evangelists, in narrating the same matter. It has already been sufficiently explained. (See last note.)

The quotation is from one of the Messianic Psalms; it is an allegory taken from architecture, as the parable is from the business of agriculture carried on by tenants. Both figures are combined by Paul in 1 Cor. iii. 9. "For we are co-laborers with God" in cultivating his vineyard —in erecting his building, the church (see Matt. xvi. 18). "Ye are God's husbandry," or tillage, "Ye are God's building." A building is, perhaps, the most common figure of the true church (1 Pet. ii. 5; Eph. ii. 20–22, iv. 16; 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19) taken, as we suppose, from our Lord's declaration (Matt. xvi. 18). "On this foundation (οἰκοδομήσω) I *will build* my church," &c. The quotation we are considering implies, that Israel, as a nation, were first chosen as the builders. Their election to this service was connected with exceeding great and glorious promises, but proving unfaithful to their trust in all their generations, they forfeited their privileges, and God was about not only to take them away, but inflict condign punishment, as the Lord had solemnly declared at the conclusion of the parable (Luke xx. 16; Mark xii. 9).

Verse 43. "Therefore (Διὰ τοῦτο, for this reason) I say unto you, The kingdom of God, which was first promised to you as a nation, shall be taken from you," as a nation, and "shall be given (ἔθνει) to a nation bringing forth (ποιοῦντι, making or producing) the fruits thereof."

This declaration of the Saviour is recorded only by Matthew. It stands in immediate connexion with the quotation from the cxviii. Psalm, and sets forth in the plainest language, the import and bearing of the parable. The last clause of the verse, "bringing forth the fruits thereof," shows the connexion. The chief priests and the pharisees, if they

doubted about the meaning before, could doubt no longer (vs. 45). We might, perhaps, without marring the sense, transpose this verse, so as to read it in connexion with the 41st and the 44th verse, in connexion with the 42d—although we conceive the actual arrangement was designed to interlock the quotation from the Psalm with the parable, and then to declare the moral or import of both in their order.

However this may be, the verse, taken in connexion with the preceding context, declares the result of the legal dispensation, which is the great lesson of the parable. That dispensation commenced at Horeb (the place which Israel reached on the 47th day after their exodus from Egypt), amidst the most wonderful displays of the Divine presence, favor, and power. While encamped at that place, the law was delivered to them, and they were brought into new covenant relations with God, Moses being the mediator (Gal. iii. 19). It will be instructive to dwell a little on this subject.

The blessings which God covenanted to bestow on Israel, upon the condition of their obedience, are here summed by

18.) This covenant was renewed at Schechem in the time of Joshua (Josh. xxiv. 22–25), and many years afterwards in the reign of Joash (2 Kings xi. 17; 2 Chron. xxiii. 16); and again in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 2, 3; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30, 31; see Jerem. xi. 1–10). It was renewed in the days of Asa (2 Chron. xv. 12), and again in the days of Nehemiah (chaps. ix. and x.), and this renewal is one of the last events recorded by inspiration in the public history of that people. Strictly, therefore, it was not only a national, but a *continuing* covenant—running with the race of Israel and embracing that people in all their generations. The mission of John the Baptist presupposed that the covenant with the nation still subsisted, and his baptism and preaching repentance assumed that the national repentance and faith and hearty compliance with the covenant on the part of the whole people, should secure to that generation the covenanted blessings notwithstanding the sins of their forefathers. Nay more, the Lord assured them, that it was because they not only yielded no fruits, but (in the words of the parable) were about to kill the son and heir, that the kingdom would be taken from them.

The covenant then was a *subsisting* one, and the parable teaches us, on the one hand, that the nation had continually broken it in all their generations, and on the other that God had forborne with them, and as it were held himself bound by his promises until that time, though he might justly have cast the whole nation off, generations before, as he did ten of their tribes, and would have done so with the rest had it not been for his covenant with David (Jer. xxxiii. 17; 1 Kings viii. 25; 2 Chron. vi. 16). But now the time had come when he would forbear no longer. The covenant with David he had fulfilled so far as to raise up the Messiah from his seed, and send him to the nation. He was the Son mentioned in the parable. By rejecting him and putting him to death, that generation filled up the measure of Divine forbearance to their nation (Matt. xxiii. 32), and the covenanted kingdom was declared to be forfeited.

By the kingdom of God, our Lord alludes especially, as we suppose, to the words in Exod. xix. 6. "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests." However this may be, we

cannot be mistaken in supposing that the kingdom of God had been committed to that people in some *especial* sense (Rom. ix. 4, 5), or at least that the nation stood in some peculiar relation to it; as the husbandmen did, to the vineyard. If it were not so, we see not how the kingdom of God could have been taken from them, and given to another nation. That the kingdom of God was not theirs by right of ownership, is too plain to be mentioned. The nature of the promise forbids us to suppose any other privilege than that of eminent service, and the exalted glory and happiness connected with such service. We infer this from the words last quoted from Exod. xix. 6. "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests." A promise which reminds us of Rev. i. 6, v. 10, xx. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 9; passages, which we may regard as expository of the words of this covenant. Adopting this as the meaning, God's covenant with the nation was, that he would make it the honored instrument in His hand of bringing back to the world His kingdom, which it should be their privilege first to enter, and then (under the Messiah) to administer (see Dan. vii. 27)

2), into which all those who had been given to Him by the Father in the covenant of redemption should enter, and no others—in one word, His Church. The idea he does not develope. It was the fact only of the substitution of another nation in the place of Israel, which he now declares. In his intercessory prayer (John xvii. See note Journ. vol. viii. 95–100), the elect people, intended in this place under the idea or description of a nation, are much more distinctly referred to.

But what we desire the reader particularly to notice is, that the original plan of committing the kingdom, in the sense explained, to *one* nation, chosen out of *all* the nations, is not abandoned in consequence of the unfaithfulness of the nation first chosen. That is not the method of the Divine administration. Of the march of Divine Providence it may truly be said, *Nulla vestigia retrorsum.* The owner of the vineyard did not resolve to destroy it or abandon it, or throw it open to the first occupant in consequence of the bad faith and wickedness of the first tenants. His plan he persists in. The only change he makes is in the *persons* he employs to execute his original design. So in the interpretation of the parable. The only change to be made, is the substitution of one nation (represented by a company of tenants) for another, though raised up and constituted by a different method. The first was elected as a race according to the flesh—the second are begotten of God, by the Spirit (John i. 13; James i. 18). The first appeared visibly on earth from the time they were first chosen as an organized people, and continued visible through many generations. The second has ever been, and still is, without a local habitation or a name among the nations. The greater portion of it has passed the gates of death. Some are passing now, and some, perhaps many, are yet to come into being. Those composing the fragment of it now on earth (comparatively but a small number) are scattered as wheat growing among tares, with no marks of distinction but the fruits of the kingdom they bear. Nor are they to be gathered during the present order of things, and visibly appear as one body. The gates of Hades which conceal them must first be unbarred (Matt. xvi. 18), and the Lord himself appear in his glory to establish his kingdom, and judge the

nations,* before their number can be consummated, and they can appear (Matt. xvi. 18, and note Journ. viii. p. 106, 108).

Those who understand by the kingdom of God, the present dispensation of the gospel among all nations, conclude, consistently enough with their theory, that the promises first made *exclusively* to Israel are to be bestowed upon all nations without discrimination, but in doing so they disregard the obvious import of the words of the Saviour; for admitting that in consequence of the fall of Israel, the kingdom of God is to be preached to all nations and to every creature (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mk. xvi. 15), yet it follows not that all will receive it; on the contrary, our Lord teaches with express reference to this dispensation, that although the many are called, few only are chosen (Matt. xvii. 14), and the chosen ones only enter into that elect nation upon which the kingdom promised to Israel will be conferred.

It is plain also, that if those specific blessings which were conditionally promised to Israel at Horeb—(the same that the Saviour solemnly declared should be taken from them

called the Head Stone. Isaiah (viii. 13, 14, 15), foreseeing his rejection by Israel, calls him a stone of stumbling and rock of offence (see 1 Pet. ii. 6–8; Rom. ix. 33; Acts iv. 11; Eph. ii. 20); and Daniel (ii. 34, 45) evidently refers to the Messiah under the emblem of a stone cut out of the mountain without hands. The verse we are considering comprises the totality of the present dispensation of the gospel. In the first clause of it, our Lord refers, as we doubt not, to Isaiah viii. 14, 15, which was eminently fulfilled in the fall of Israel, and the breaking up and continued dispersion of the nation by the Romans. Regarded as a prophecy, it denotes the events more plainly described in the next parable, under the imagery of a captured and burned city (Matt. xxii. 7). The prediction has also been fulfilled in the uninterrupted calamities the Jews have suffered in all their generations since that event, in consequence of their hitherto abiding blindness and unbelief (Luke xxi. 22–24). Thus understood, how fearfully significant is this prediction!

In the last clause of this verse, our Lord refers, as we suppose, to the prophecy of Daniel (ii. 31–45), and especially to verses 34 and 45. He points us to the end of the times of the Gentiles (Luke xxi. 24), and those terrible judgments which are to precede the restoration of Israel, and the dispensation of the restitution of all things.*

These judgments, we are taught, will fall in their intensity upon the nations symbolized by the image (Dan. ii. 31–38), or as Paul teaches (2 Thess. i. 8, 9) upon those in Christian lands who are living in heathen ignorance of God, notwithstanding the gospel has been fully preached among them.

The fourth kingdom represented in the image (Dan. ii. 40) is, by the almost universal consent of interpreters, understood to be the Roman Empire, as it existed at the commencement of our era. Its bounds, as then established, comprise Christendom in its largest extent in any age. Hence, we understand the apostle and the prophet as referring to the same judgments. But what we would especially

* Compare this clause with Dan. ii. 45, in the Greek: Καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ..... λεπτυνεῖ καὶ λεκμήσει πασας τὰς βασιλείας, κ. τ. λ.

remark is, the discriminative justice of the Divine administration, and the difference which these words of the Saviour put between the breakers of the law, and those who abuse the grace of the gospel. Severe as were the judgments which came upon Israel, they were not *utterly* destructive. Though the nation, by falling on this stone, was broken, and scattered to the four winds of heaven; and although the days of vengeance have come upon that people, in which all things written by Moses (Deut. xxviii. 15–68) and the prophets shall be fulfilled (Luke xxi. 22), yet they have been, and are still preserved, as a race of men; and when these days shall be ended, they shall be restored (Deut. xxx. 1–6) to their land and the Divine favor, and a new covenant shall be made with them, different from the covenant made with their fathers (Heb. viii. 8–13; Jer. xxxi. 31–34), while a full end shall be made of all the nations upon which the stone shall fall (Jer. xlvi. 27, 28; Dan. ii. 35, 45. See vii. 11; see Heb. x. 28, 29).

Verse 45. "And the chief priests and pharisees hearing his parables, knew that he spake of them."

hand, as has been already said, was designed to apply to all classes, without distinction; not to the influential or governing classes in particular, and this remark of the evangelist discriminates between them in their application.

Matt. xxii. *The parable of the Marriage.*

This is the last of our Lord's public parables. It was pronounced, as the two last mentioned were, in the temple at Jerusalem, just before his final departure from it. It is an allegory consisting of two parts; the first part ending at (vs. 7) the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans (A.D.70), and the second, stretching forward through the whole of the present dispensation of the gospel among the Gentiles down to the second coming of the Lord, and the gathering of His elect people to himself. It is a similitude of the kingdom of heaven, but altogether different in its design from those recorded in the 13th chapter of this gospel. The action of the parable commences at the earliest with the preaching of John the Baptist. By the marriage festival, we understand the peculiar blessings included in the covenant Jehovah made with Israel at Horeb. (See notes on the last parable.)

By the invitation to the marriage, we understand, the call made by John, and our Lord and his apostles, upon the nation to perform the conditions of that covenant by receiving the kingdom and its king with the obedience of faith. The first invited guests were all those whom John was sent to baptize—the whole nation, without distinction or exception. The servants first sent forth (vs. 3), had executed their commission, when John was put to death (Matt. xiv. 1–13. See notes on that passage). The other servants (vs. 4) had executed their commission when Jerusalem, on the eve of its overthrow, was encompassed by the Roman armies, A. D. 70. The 8th verse is a formal repudiation of Israel, as the elect people under the covenant of law (Hos. i. 9), which became irrevocable and complete when the temple was destroyed, and the people dispersed among all nations by the sword of the Romans (Luke xxi. 24). The theocracy was then entirely withdrawn, and Jew and Gentile were placed absolutely upon the same level, in respect to the Divine proceedings shadowed forth in the 9th and 10th verses of the parable (see the note on Acts iii. 19–21. Journ. vol. x. p. 569–572). For after those events, that

people could be found only on "the highways and hedges" (Luke xiv. 23), and if brought to the marriage at all, must be brought from thence, with such others, as were found willing to obey the call of the king's servants.

Consider, again, the brevity with which the greatest events the world has witnessed are represented. The whole history of the preaching of the gospel, from the fall of Jerusalem, hangs on these two verses (9th and 10th). To mention only a few of them:—(1) The persecutions under Domitian (A.D. 94),* under Trajan (A.D. 155), Antonine (A.D. 164), Septimus Severus (A.D. 205), Maximin (A.D 235), Decius (A.D. 251), Valerian (A.D. 255), Aurelian (A.D. 270), and Diocletian (A.D. 303). Next, (2) the establishment of Christianity by Constantine (A.D. 323), as the religion of the Roman Empire. (3) The rise of the Papacy, and its progress to unbounded power. (4) The corruption of Christian doctrine by Arians and other heretics; by Popes and councils. (5) The Reformation from Popery; the rise and progress of the Protestant churches; and (6) the more recent Christian missions to pagan countries; and the translating, printing, and distribu-

servants have executed the king's command, he appears. The representation of the parable, in this respect, is in harmony with the doctrine of the uncertainty of the time of our Lord's coming (Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxiv. 36). It depends (if we may so say) upon the full execution of the commission which the Lord gave the apostles, and through them to all his servants and followers (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Matt. xxiv. 14). When that elect people who, in the Divine purpose, have been substituted in the place of Israel, shall be fully gathered, then the Lord will appear in their midst and celebrate that marriage festival which this parable represents (see Rev. xix. 9).

Commentators have noticed the likeness between this parable and that of the great supper (Luke xiv. 15–24). That parable is, in truth, a similitude of the kingdom of heaven, although it was not put forth as such. It shows the manner in which the Jewish nation, and the Jews individually, refused the kingdom when it was preached to them by John and our Lord (vs. 16–20). It shadows forth, also, the present dispensation of the gospel among the Gentiles (vs. 21–24). But the parable under consideration, so far as it respects the Jews as the elect people, is more specific. It was pronounced *as a similitude of the kingdom* which had been preached to *them* exclusively; and, consequently, they only were represented by the first invited guests. And when our Lord comes to speak of the judgments which their national and individual sins were about to bring upon them, he almost drops the drapery of the parable, that he might show them not only the nature of these judgments, but the form in which they would come (vs. 7). Their city should be burned, and they themselves should be destroyed by the armies which their king, whom they had dishonored and contemned, would send upon them. It is to be noticed, also, that in the parable of the great supper, our Lord does not represent the occasion upon which it was made, nor does he denote the character or rank of the person who made it; nor does it appear that any particular relation subsisted between him and the guests he invited. It was addressed to an individual, at a private entertainment, in reply to an observation which implied a too confident expectation of enjoying the blessings of the kingdom. This parable, on the other hand, is founded

upon the relation between a king and his subjects. The occasion was an extraordinary one, intimately connected with the honor of the king, and of the heir of his throne. The dishonor done him by his subjects was a breach of their allegiance for which they deserved, and received, severe punishment. As before suggested, it is the complement of the two preceding parables, and was added to show the grounds of the Divine judgments as they affected *all* classes of the people, without discrimination between the rulers and the ruled. Thus much upon the scope and general import of this parable. We now proceed to submit a few observations on some of the particulars.

Verse 2. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son."

As the marriage was not celebrated at the time first appointed, on account of the unworthy behavior of the invited guests, but deferred for a little space, until other guests could be invited and assembled: so the kingdom of heaven would not be established at its first announcement,

this latter sense chiefly we understand the call intended in the parable (see John i. 11, 12). But "they (the people) would not come."

During this period none of the preachers of the kingdom suffered death at the hands of the people. John was put to death by Herod at the instigation of Herodias, through motives of private revenge, several months after his public ministry was ended. (See note on Luke iii. 20, 21, Journ. vol. xi. pp. 92, 93.) The sin of the people in respect to John's ministry consisted chiefly in their not receiving him with the obedience of faith.

Verse 4. "Again he sent forth other servants, saying: Tell them which are bidden: Behold I have prepared my dinner; my oxen and my fatlings *are* killed, and all things *are* ready: Come to the marriage."

Interpreting this parable in accordance with the distinctions taken in preceding notes (see notes on Matt. xiv. 10, xv. 30, xviii. 11, foot note), the second mission of the servants (which may be called the second act of the parable) commenced at the death of John and ended at the destruction of Jerusalem; consequently it includes the latter portion of our Lord's public ministry, the mission of the seventy disciples (Luke x.), and the whole ministry of all the apostles, except the apostle John, under their second commission. While our Lord remained with them, none of them suffered death or violence (John xvii. 12, xviii. 8, 9). After his death persecutions arose. Stephen was stoned (Acts vii. 59, viii. 1); Herod vexed some of the church and killed James (Acts xii. 1, 2). The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul contain abundant evidence that persecutions of the apostles and their disciples, by the Jews, were rife and unrelenting, which Paul alleges as a reason why the wrath of God was about to break forth against that people, and abide upon them (εἰς τέλος) until the end (i.e. αἰωνος, 1 Thess. ii. 14–16). Their cruel treatment of the servants of "the king" was the filling up of their sins, and provoked him to destroy them and their city.

Vs. 5. "But (αμελησαντες, neglecting or paying no attention to the call) they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm and another to his merchandise."

Of those called or invited, there were two classes. The

one merely made light of or neglected the invitation, preferring their ordinary avocations to the honor their king proffered them. This was probably a numerous and perhaps much the largest class. To such the apostle seems to allude in Heb. ii. 3.*

Vs. 6. "And the remnant" (οἱ δὲ λοιποί, but the rest, *namely* those who did not merely neglect the call) "took his servants and entreated *them* spitefully and slew *them*."

The representation in this verse compels us to extend this second mission of the servants to the destruction of Jerusalem. Historical facts would not justify the representation if this second mission terminated before our Lord's ascension; for none of the king's servants were slain until *after* that event. Besides it has been shown (see note on Acts iii. 19–21, vol. x. pp. 569–573) that while the temple stood, and the worship of it was permitted, and the rites of their law allowed to Jewish converts by the apostles, the Jews had not entirely lost their prerogative (see Acts xiii. 46). Peter addressed them as still "the children of the prophets and

covenanted kingdom. Trial had been made of them under the covenant of law, *before* the Holy Spirit was given. Trial had been made of them again, under the covenant of grace, *after* the Spirit was given. For a time the gospel was preached to them exclusively (Acts xi. 19, see Gal. ii. 7). The epistles of Paul, and Peter, and James (falling as they do within this period), show how abundantly the apostles labored in their behalf. They were tried nearly forty years—a whole generation—as faithfully as the Gentiles were, but with less effect, though they had the advantage of greater light and knowledge. But all in vain. By their neglect and contempt of the gospel, and their persecutions of the "servants of the king," they proved themselves unworthy, and they were cast off.

Verse 9. "Go ye, therefore, into the highways, and as many as ye shall find bid to the marriage."

This may be called the third great action of the parable. It commenced at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jews among all nations. The end of it we see not yet. All the apostles (except John) were then dead. The servants intended, therefore, must be those composing the churches which had been organized and established by the apostles in various parts of Asia, Europe, and Africa, or their leaders or rulers. Thus interpreted, the parable regards them as missionaries, or missionary bodies, whose chief duty it was to execute the command of the king. It is noticeable also that the command could not be applicable personally to Peter or Paul. They had fulfilled their course. Nor even to John, nor to any one servant. It was addressed to many; to all the king's servants. The parable contemplates, therefore, no hierarchy organized under one supreme head, but individual servants, each having the same mission and charged with the same duties, and accountable only to the king, their master.

If we interpret this verse by Matt. xxviii. 19, xxiv. 14, Mk. xvi. 15, the mission of the servants was and is world-wide, and its duration (though not defined) till the second coming of the Lord, represented in the parable by the king's coming in to see the guests. Indeed that great event seems to be dependent upon the full execution of this service, and consequently (according to the representation of the parable)

will occur sooner or later according to the zeal, activity, and success of the servants in performing it. Thus interpreted, the motive which the parable furnishes for missions with those who love the Lord's appearing (see 2 Tim. iv. 8) is stronger than any other that can be imagined.

Again, we observe that the servants were commanded to bid all, as many as, and whoever, they should find, to the marriage; that is, to the marriage festival which had been prepared, and from which the first invited guests—the Jews—had been rejected. No change in the blessings proffered is intimated, but only in the persons who were to enjoy them.

Verse 10. "So those servants went out into the highways and gathered together all, as many as they found, both bad and good, and the wedding was furnished with guests."

This is an allegorical representation of the preaching of the gospel, and of its results. The servants gathered together all, as many as they found, both *bad* and *good*. The representation is, of a mixed company; and in this respect

that represented in Matt. xxv. 31–46. The design of these verses is to exemplify, in a general way, the Lord's dealing with unworthy professors. The fault ascribed to the excluded guest, was a defect which must have been common to all the unworthy, however diversified their character in other respects. Hence one example is sufficient to impart the instruction the parable was designed to convey. But that more than one person would be thus excluded seems inferrible from verse ten and verse fourteen, which we now proceed to consider.

Verse 14. "For many are called, but few chosen."

These words occur at the conclusion of the parable of the householder and hired laborers (Matt. xx. 1–16), but the application of them is to different subjects. If we may regard the laborers in that parable under the same category as the servants in this, the rule of the Divine procedure declared in this verse, will be applied to the servants of the king as well as to those whom they were sent forth to call. That some preached the gospel from unworthy motives, even in Paul's day, is evident from Philip. i. 15–18; and that such preachers have been found in all ages since, the history of the church abundantly proves. But confining our observations to this parable, the principle is applied to the gathered results of the labors of the true and loyal servants of the king. They *called many;* and the call may be considered as made wherever, and by whatever means, the light of the gospel is spread. It is the Divine purpose, as we learn from other passages, that the world shall be fully evangelized (Matt. xxiv. 14). The mere light of the gospel is a grace and a power, irrespectively of any special and saving effect given to it upon the hearts of men, by the Holy Spirit. It dissipates the darkness of paganism. It destroys heathen idolatry and its abominations. It greatly elevates man as a rational creature. Evangelization is a gospel term for civilization. Civilization advances or retrogrades just in proportion as the light of the gospel shines brightly or is obscured. This worldly men perceive and acknowledge.

But it is not in the power or nature of light, or the mere knowledge of Divine truth, to change the moral nature of man. This is the office of the Holy Spirit. It is his especial work; and, in performing it, he acts in accordance with

the sovereign purpose of election declared in this verse. Out of the many called, he chooses whom he pleases, and by his almighty power creates them anew, in order that he may form them into a kingdom of kings and priests, and exalt them, as new creatures, to thrones of glory.

The principle thus explicitly declared at the conclusion of this parable, is identical with that which the Saviour assumed at the conclusion of the parable of the vineyard (Matt. xxi. 43). The election of Israel to be a kingdom of kings and priests unto God, was an act of divine sovereignty. No wrong was done to the nations which were then passed by. And when Israel forfeited the condition upon which the blessings of the kingdom were promised, no wrong would have been done had God chosen to substitute some contemporaneous people in their place, and confer upon them the privileges Israel had forfeited. Yet he chose rather to open a dispensation for all nations, to be continued until all of them should be called, in order "that he might take out of them a people for his name." When that purpose shall have been accomplished, he will return and build again the

27)—and they will exercise that rule over the nations of the earth, and in the kingdom of God, which was promised to Israel at Horeb, and would have been conferred upon them by the Lord Jesus (Matt. xxiii. 37), "had they indeed obeyed the voice of Jehovah, and kept his covenant" (Exod. xix. 5; Matt. xxi. 43; 1 Peter ii. 9).

PHILO.

ART. III.—REGENERATION.

BY REV. E. C. WINES, D.D.

(Continued from No. XLIV.)

IV.—THE AUTHOR OF REGENERATION IS GOD THE HOLY GHOST.

IN the work of salvation, each person of the Trinity has his own peculiar province and function; though all concur and co-operate in every part of it. Thus, redemption originated in the love of the Father and his eternal purpose of mercy to lost sinners; it was merited and obtained by the obedience and death of the Son in human nature; and it is applied and made effective by the power of the Holy Spirit, who is the author of spiritual wisdom, faith, repentance, love, and holy living. As, on the one hand, the gracious purpose of the Father could not take effect except through the work of the Son, so, on the other, the work of the Son cannot be efficient without the application of the Spirit. But "the Spirit applieth to us the redemption purchased by Christ by working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual calling;" that is, in our regeneration. Hence the Holy Ghost is called, in Scripture, the Spirit of Knowledge, the Spirit of Wisdom, the Spirit of Power, and the Spirit of Revelation in the knowledge of Christ. And love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance, which are graces of the new creature, are declared to be the fruit of the Spirit.

The necessity of the special, Almighty power of the Holy

Spirit in regeneration is evident from the fact that the change wrought therein is a change from death unto life. The Scripture hath concluded all in the state of spiritual death (see Eph. ii. 1, and Col. ii. 13). On this point, we lay down the following fundamental principle. All life is of God. This is true of vegetable, animal, and human life. It would be strange indeed, if spiritual life, the highest and sublimest species of being, formed an exception to this law. No power, less than omnipotent, can infuse life, where it is wanting. Here is a dead flower,—its freshness faded, its odor gone, its vital energy extinct. Can chemistry or philosophy, with all their boasted power, restore its color, or fragrance, or living juices to that withered and sapless thing? Here is a lamb, upon which the relentless knife has just accomplished its work of death. Limb and muscle, and tendon, and bone, and organ are there,—all perfect as when it was disporting on the green meadow. Life only is wanting. Can human ingenuity or power give back the vital principle? The galvanic current, insinuating its subtle energy into the muscular fibres, may cause the limbs

a vain pretence, a visionary claim. No man can renew his own heart; no man can renew the hearts of others. All life is of God, from the life of an archangel to the life of a fly.

The need of divine power in regeneration is further apparent from its being called in Scripture a creation. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," 2 Cor. v. 17. "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature," Gal. vi. 15. "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works," Eph. ii. 10. "That ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," Eph. iv. 24. That the above passages relate to the subject of regeneration, will not be disputed. Nor can it any more be denied that they are intended to set forth its nature, and the power by which it is wrought in the soul. If this be so, one of two things must necessarily follow: either the metaphor is unhappily chosen, and gives an exaggerated view of the subject; or the same power that called the world into being must be exerted to new create a human soul. We recur, on this head, to the elementary principle that no creature can create. All the philosophers in the world cannot create an insect or an atom. They may change, refine, and sublimate things that are; but by no power or skill which they possess can they give being to the least thing that is not. Much less can any power of man or nature give being to the noblest and most excellent of all creatures—the new and divine principle, the spiritual and heavenly life, formed in the soul by regeneration. To suppose such a thing would be derogatory to the divine nature, it would be setting the earthly above the heavenly; for that which creates must ever be more glorious than that which is created; and he who builds the house is entitled to more honor than the house.

If we consider the thing to be changed, we must admit the necessity of supernatural and almighty power in regeneration. This is the heart of a sinner; concerning which it has been well said by Flavel, that it is no more by nature disposed to this work than the wood laid upon the altar by Elijah was disposed to take fire when he had poured so much water on it as not only wet the wood, but filled up the

trench about it. It is a dark heart; so dark that He who, by an omnipotent fiat, caused the light to shine out of darkness, can alone pierce, lift, and scatter the dense folds of its spiritual ignorance. For midnight to pour the radiance of noonday upon the earth would not be a whit more supernatural or wonderful than for the natural man to cure the blindness of his heart by his own power or skill. It is a selfish heart; so selfish that all its desires, aims, plans, and doings, centre in self. For the heart to renounce, deny, and break away from this beloved self, and take God in Christ as its supreme happiness, and make his glory its chief end, requires a might as much above the powers of nature, as it would to cause the massive rocks to leave their fixed foundations and fly, like wandering meteors, through the heavens. It is a proud heart; so proud that it naturally disdains and repudiates all righteousness but that which itself has wrought out; it cannot brook to be dependent on the merit of another for acceptance with God. As well may we look to see a stone, by some power inherent in itself rise from the earth and fix itself among the stars, as

thing to obstruct it. In the old creation, the conditions were no help and no hindrance; in the new creation, the conditions are no help, but every hindrance. The exceeding difficulty of the work, and indeed the utter impossibility of accomplishing it by human power, is set forth in the pregnant interrogatory of the prophet Jeremiah, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" If omnipotence is required to whiten the dusky skin of the African, to erase the spots of the leopard, and to change the fierceness of the lion into the gentleness of the lamb, much more is such almighty power requisite to slay the enmity of the sinner's heart, and to cause him to give up his darling lusts, to forsake the ways of sin, at once so sweet and profitable, to renounce his own best performances and excellences, to come naked and empty to Christ for a share in his righteousness, to forego his own carnal joys, and to delight in the law of God after the inward man. "The new birth," says an excellent old divine, "is a change of nature; of a nature where there was as little of spiritual good, as there was of being in nothing before the creation. It is the change of a stone into flesh; of a heart that, like a stone, has hardness and settledness of sinful parts, a strong resistance against any instrument, an incorporation of sin and lust with its very nature; where the heart and sin, self and sin, are cordially one and the same. None can change such a nature but the God of all grace. No man can change the nature of the meanest creature in the world. Now, to see a lump of vice become the model of virtue, and him that drank in iniquity like water to thirst after righteousness, to crucify his darling flesh, to be weary of the poison he loved and desire the purity he hated, speaks a supernatural grace, transcendently attractive and powerfully operative."

The marked difference in the success of the gospel, under the same or like circumstances, shows that the excellency of the power in regeneration must be of God and not man. Peter preached the gospel to the crowds gathered at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and three thousand were converted; Stephen, with no less pungency and power, preached the same gospel to the same people, in the same city of Jerusalem, and was buried beneath a shower of

stones. In the one case, the hearers were "pricked in their hearts," and cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" In the other case, they were "cut to the heart," and gnashed upon the preacher with their teeth. When Paul preached at Athens, Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, with a few others, believed and became Christians; but the body of his hearers mocked and derided him. Under the preaching of the prophet Malachi, a few had their hearts touched by grace, concerning whom it is said, "they feared the Lord and spake often one to another;" but of the majority of the nation it is recorded that their words were, "stout against the Lord," and they said, "it is a vain thing to serve God." The Master himself often visited Jerusalem, but he gained few disciples there; he spent but two days at Sychar, yet many of the Samaritans in that city believed on him. He spent much time in Capernaum, and preached many sermons there; a few were taken out of the mass, and set as jewels in the Redeemer's crown; but the most repented not

ing to the winds and the wild waves of the sea. But when Christ rises from his throne and pours down his Spirit, then the weakest means are infinitely mighty. Then the gospel does not come in word only, but, like the stone hurled from the sling of David, it sinks into the hardest heart, and even giants in sin are brought to the dust. If the weapons of our warfare were mighty in themselves, they would at all times be equally successful; but the event makes it manifest that they are mighty only through the might of omnipotence, and that that divine power is exerted in a way of sovereign grace.

Thus far the argument on this head has been conducted mainly upon grounds of reason. But on a subject of this nature, the chief resort, the ultimate appeal, must be to the sacred record. "To the law and the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

If we take the Bible for our guide and yield our faith to its authority, there cannot remain a doubt that God is the sole author of regeneration; that there is an inward, almighty, gloriously efficient power of the Holy Ghost exerted to produce the change indicated by that term.

Clear and unequivocal to this effect is the testimony of our Lord in John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Much learned and rather unprofitable discussion has been expended upon the inquiry, what we are to understand by the term water in this passage. One interpreter takes it to mean our natural birth; another, the obedience of Christ; a third, baptism; and so on. To enter into speculations of this nature is foreign to our present purpose. With Witsius, we reject all these views, and suppose rather that water is here to be taken as an emblem of the Spirit, as fire is in the passage where we are said to be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The meaning will then be, that in order to our entering into the kingdom of heaven, we must be born of the Spirit, whose office is to purify the soul, as that of water is to cleanse the body. Nothing is more common with the sacred writers than to represent the Holy Spirit under the symbol of water. See a proof of this in Isaiah, xliv. 2: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty;

* * * I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed." The same truth is here expressed in two forms, the one figurative, the other literal; the literal being introduced to explain the figurative. But whatever way the term water is interpreted here does not affect the main sense, which is plainly to this purport, that the sole author of the new birth, and of all spiritual life, is God the Holy Ghost.

The same truth is taught, with equal clearness and emphasis, in those passages which speak of our being born from above, of our being born of God, of our being born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. In these Scriptures, the determining cause and efficient agency in our regeneration are wholly taken away from the creature and given to the almighty Creator.

In numerous places of holy writ, God claims regeneration as his own work. "The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul," Deut. xxx. 6. "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their

to, all spiritual motions. Now this inaptitude and stubbornness, this impotence and enmity to God, this total inability to all good, God says that He will take away; and not only so, but that he will give, in its place, a new heart, a new spirit, by virtue of which we shall be his people, and walk in his statutes, and keep his ordinances. He does not say that he will endeavor to do all this, that he will use means to do it, that he will help those who undertake the work; but he says, absolutely and positively, that he himself will do it. So distinctly and emphatically does God challenge the work of regeneration as his own.

Other Scriptures innumerable are to the same general purport. "No man can come to me," says the Saviour, "except the Father who hath sent me draw him," John vi. 44; and again in vs. 65, "No man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father." This strips the whole human race of all power to renew their own hearts. "No man can come to me." Not an individual of the human family, whatever his natural qualifications or external advantages, however he may be disposed or prepared, whatever arguments or means may be used with him, whether wise and learned, or ignorant and illiterate,—no man can of himself come to Christ, can believe on him, can renew his own heart. This must be given to him from above; he must be powerfully drawn by a divine influence. The same thing is asserted, both negatively and positively, in Eph. ii. 8: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." The apostle here draws a contrast between our ability and the gift of God, and affirms that salvation has its source in the latter, to the exclusion of the former. And further, he informs us in verse 10, how God bestows this gift upon us, viz. by creating us anew in Christ Jesus, as his own workmanship. "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save me, and I shall be saved; turn me, and I shall be turned," Jer. xvii. 14, and xxxi. 18. Two things are declared in these Scriptures, as plainly as language can perform that office; first, that God alone is the author of conversion; secondly, that when he undertakes the work, it is effectually done. Illustrious is the testimony of the apostle in Phil. ii. 13: "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good

pleasure." What is the plain instruction of this text? First, that God, by his effectual working, gives the will to goodness; secondly, that, by a like efficient operation, he imparts the ability to put that will into execution; and thirdly, that in all this he acts as a sovereign, who giveth no account of his matters. Other Scriptures assure us that God "works in us that which is well pleasing in his sight;" that he "begets us anew to a lively hope;" and that he "fulfils in us the work of faith with power;"—all bearing concurrent testimony to the doctrine, that there is an immediate and efficient divine operation upon the soul in the new birth.

Most significant and instructive, in this connexion, is the parable of the dry bones in Ezekiel's vision. Those bones were not only without life, but without any desire for life, or any power in themselves to recover it. They lay motionless and dead in the open valley, till the Spirit of God sent life and power and motion into them. So the sovereign and almighty power of the Holy Ghost calls us from the death

drawn. "The natural heart," says an able living divine, "is indeed dead in sin, wholly inclined to evil, and can therefore bring forth no good thing. But the death of a spiritual, immortal, and ever-active soul, is as different from the death of the body, as spirit is different from matter. The dead body is wholly motionless and unconscious; but the dead soul is willingly and intelligently active in wickedness. There is a will in the dead soul, and although that will is in bondage to Satan, it is still will, and it is in bondage because the heart loves sin. Hence, though our conversion is the work of the Holy Spirit, the sinner is commanded to 'turn unto God,' and he is condemned for not repenting, because by his impenitence he doth 'always resist the Holy Ghost,' and 'will not come unto Christ that he might have life.' There is a difficulty here, it is admitted, but it is not a practical difficulty. Every sinner knows that he continues to sin voluntarily; and every reader of the Scripture knows that, if he 'yield himself to God,' the Spirit will take possession of his heart; and every one who puts these two truths together must know that, if he be not converted, it is his own fault, because he has not only neglected striving to enter the strait gate, but has struggled against the Spirit lest he should be brought to enter. Dependence upon the grace of the Holy Ghost for a new life is no excuse or warrant for our idleness, but, on the contrary, rebukes it; else there were no meaning in the command, 'make you a new heart and a new spirit;' or in the promise, 'they that seek shall find;' or in the condemnation of them who have not 'believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God.'" (Dr. Bethune on the Fruit of the Spirit.)

It has been much discussed whether the subjects of regeneration are active or passive at the moment when the change takes place. This question, like that which has been raised concerning the order of time in which faith and repentance spring up in the soul, is rather speculative and curious than practical and important. For as these two graces can never be separated, but must necessarily co-exist in the soul, though in the order of nature faith must be supposed to precede and work repentance; so, in regeneration, the soul must be conceived to be passive at the instant of its occurrence, since men in themselves no more contri-

bute to their spiritual than to their natural birth, yet, in the very nature of things, the spiritual activities commence at the same point of time. No sooner is grace infused into the soul, than, as a necessary consequence, gracious affections and gracious actings begin to manifest themselves. We have always regarded as eminently scriptural and satisfactory the ground taken by President Edwards on this point, in his observations concerning Efficacious Grace, viz. that in efficacious grace we are not merely passive, nor yet does God do a part of the work, and we the rest. But God does all, and we do all. God produces all, and we act all; for the very things which God produces are our own actions, for as the apostle teaches, he works in us to do. God is the fountain and author of our activities, while we are the proper actors. In one sense, therefore, we are wholly passive; in another but equally scriptural sense, we are wholly active. The Scriptures, in innumerable places, represent the same things as from God and from us. God is said to sprinkle clean water upon us and cleanse us from all our filthiness;

priate actings of this new life. Regeneration is grace bestowed; conversion is grace used. In regeneration, God draws; in conversion, we run after him. Regeneration is the motion of God towards and upon the heart of a sinner; conversion is the movement of a sinner towards God consequent thereupon.

The mode of the Spirit's operation on the human soul in regeneration is hid from the eyes of all living. This is one of the secret things which belong to God, and is wrapt in profoundest mystery. So our Saviour has taught us in his conversation with Nicodemus, John iii. 8: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Three things are intimated here, viz. the mystery, the reality, and the variety of the Spirit's work in regeneration. 1. It is mysterious. There are innumerable phenomena, even in the natural world, which, as to their causes and processes, defy all explanation. Of these one of the most wonderful and unfathomable is our natural birth. Who can declare its secrets? The Psalmist in the contemplation of this marvel, could only exclaim, "I am fearfully and wonderfully made." But if the most sagacious are baffled in their inquiries into the origin and mode of our bodily life, who shall explore and unfold the origin and mode of our spiritual life? If an impenetrable darkness shuts out all knowledge of the former, how much more of the latter! Yet, 2. The work of the Spirit in regeneration is none the less real because mysterious. Its mystery is no argument against its verity. "The application of the figure," says Bloomfield, *in loc.*, "is that a man knows that his heart is more interested in religion, that he has a deeper insight and greater relish for spiritual truths; and though he does not perceive the immediate influence from which this change proceeded, yet the effects he knows by communing with his own heart. And they are of a kind which he must ascribe to the Author of all good, though he cannot trace the exact process by which that heavenly agency was employed for that effect; yet he does not the less believe its reality." But 3. This operation of the Spirit in the new birth, though ever the same in its essence, is, like the blowing of the wind, infinitely varied in its circum-

stances. We see the pliant willow bend gently before the vernal zephyr, we see the grass, the flowers, and the golden grain wave gently in the summer breeze, we see the quiet stream flow gently on between its verdant banks. So gently, at times, does the Holy Spirit breathe upon a human soul; so calm, so gentle, so lovely, and so pure are the influences which invite to thought, to prayer, to God, to heaven. We see the heavens gather blackness;—the lightnings play, the thunder rolls, the tempest howls, the tornado sweeps over hill and vale, the roots of the sturdy oak are uptorn, and the stately structure quivers in every timber. With such overwhelming power does the Spirit of God sometimes assault the soul of man; and the stouthearted sinner trembles under the influence of the truth, as the giant elm quivers beneath the wintry blast, or bends before the rushing whirlwind. He sees, as it were, the cloud of wrath gather; he hears the thunder of justice; flashes from Sinai dart along his guilty path; and he is prostrated before the power of God, like the forest before the sweeping and resistless tempest. But

in our preaching of the gospel); we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God," 2 Cor. v. 20. The power of the word in convincing, enlightening, renewing, and reconciling men to God, is unequivocally and repeatedly declared in the sacred record. "The weapons of our warfare," says Paul (meaning the truths of the gospel), "are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. And to the same effect, but still more emphatically, in Heb. iv. 12: "The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." No heart is so hard, no conscience so seared, but this weapon can pierce it through and through. And with these didactic statements of the truth, accords the historic record contained in Acts ii. 37: "When they heard this (a plain and pungent proclamation of the gospel) they were pricked in the heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" This cry has been repeated by unnumbered millions since that day; by men of every age, of every clime, of every condition—the honorable and the ignoble, the renowned and the obscure, the learned and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, the wise and the foolish, the monarch and the vassal—have all in turn felt the soul-piercing, soul-subduing, soul-restoring power of gospel truth, as read on the printed page, or heard from the living voice. That the means employed by the Divine Spirit in regenerating dead souls, is the word of God, is still further evident from 1 Pet. i. 23, where we are said to be "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." How clear and decisive is this testimony! David bears witness to the same truth, in a glow of holy exultation over the living and quickening power of the divine word: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure,

enlightening the eyes," Ps. xix. 7, 8. The connexion in which this passage stands, is noteworthy and instructive. The former part of the psalm is a magnificent and glowing description of the visible heavens. Wrapped in the contemplation of the glorious power and wisdom of God, as displayed in those worlds of light hung out in the firmament above him, the writer pours forth a strain of sublimities and beauties unsurpassed in the whole range of descriptive poetry. He is charmed with the beauty of the stupendous and dazzling scene; he is awed by its sublimity; he draws instruction from the majestic movement of those starry worlds; and with the eloquence of inspired genius, he commends to all the children of mortality the lucid lessons they convey. But suddenly he arrests himself amid the rush of his lofty imagination; he descends from his adventurous flight amid suns and stars; he comes to read a better lesson in a better volume. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." He found sublime instruction in the works of God; but in his word alone he found the lesson

him an earnest desire of deliverance. The gospel comes to him with its proclamation of mercy;—exhibiting Christ as the surety of all those who believe in him; making known his willingness to save, and the fulness of his merit and grace; freely offering his salvation to all who will accept it on the terms of repentance and faith, followed by the fruits of holy living; showing him, at the same time, the excellence of that spiritual life, of which Christ is at once the author and the model; and pressing him, by the most powerful motives and the most persuasive exhortations, to deny all carnal appetites and give himself up to be new moulded and formed by the Spirit of God. Thus is the conscience roused, the mind enlightened, the will subdued, the affections rectified, true penitence awakened, hatred of sin begotten, the heart renewed, and all the graces of the Spirit wrought in the soul.

Such, according to the clearest teaching of holy Scripture, is the power of the truth as it is in Jesus. A caution, however, must be entered here. It must be carefully noted that the word of God is only the instrumental and not the efficient cause of regeneration. Were the truth sufficient of itself, all who hear might be expected to receive and obey it; nay, they certainly would receive and obey it; for whatever works naturally, works necessarily. If, therefore, the converting power of the word were inherent in it, it would infallibly convert all to whom it comes, unless we suppose some miracle to supervene and prevent it. It is the Spirit that quickens. Separated from the efficient power of the Spirit, the word can accomplish nothing. The word, says an inspired penman, is the sword of the Spirit. Now, as a sword must be wielded by a strong hand, so must the word be wielded by the Spirit. It has been said that if men were as eloquent as the Holy Ghost, they could regenerate sinners as well as he; a proposition which implies that the change wrought in regeneration is produced wholly by the power of moral suasion. According to this view, men are converted in the same way they are induced to engage in any worldly enterprise,—by the mere force of light and argument; a theory as dangerous as it is unscriptural, as destructive to the souls of men as it is derogatory to the power and grace of God. The trumpet gives no sound,

till the breath of a man is breathed into it; the mantle of Elijah parted not the waters of Jordan, till the Lord God of Elijah gave it power to that end; the wheels of Ezekiel moved not, till the Spirit moved them; in like manner, the word of God has no efficiency except what it derives from the Spirit of God, working in and by it. That radical change of the mind, the will, the affections, and the life, in which the new birth consists, is not wrought in the soul efficiently by the power of the truth, however clearly seen or strongly felt, but by the immediate, sovereign, and almighty power of God the Holy Ghost.

VI.—THE FRUITS AND EVIDENCES OF REGENERATION.

In 2 Cor. v. 17, the change which takes place in passing from the state of nature to the state of grace is set forth in the following terms: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." This description is brief, but clear and em-

He realizes God more than he did. His being, power, and presence are something more to him than a name. Before he seldom thought of God, and when he did, the thought was painful, and therefore banished as speedily as possible; now God is seldom out of his thoughts, and he thinks of him with delight. He sees God in his works, and enjoys him in his gifts. The air, the light, the genial warmth of the sun, the birds, the flowers, food, raiment, shelter, friends, —all the bounties of providence are to him what God makes them. God himself is in these enjoyments; and it is because the divine goodness is tasted in them that they are so precious to him. He looks up to God, he confides in God, he loves God as a father. He chooses God as the portion of his soul. He seeks and he finds his highest happiness in communion with God. How bright, how amiable, how dear do the divine perfections appear to him! Especially the divine goodness and love, how sweet and ravishing the view he is sometimes, at least, permitted to take of them!

The new man has new views of Christ and new exercises towards him. "To them that believe he is precious." Before, Christ was without form or comeliness; there was no beauty in him to awaken desire; now he is the chief among ten thousand, altogether lovely, the rose of Sharon, the lily of the valley. The beauty of his person, the beauty of his character, the beauty of his government, the beauty of his redemption, the preciousness of his blood, in a word, his entire suitableness to the needs of a sinner, are seen and realized as they never were before. Christ is the fountain in which the Christian is continually washing his guilty soul from the stains of sin; Christ is the rock continually giving out living water, of which the Christian drinks and is refreshed; Christ is the treasury of grace, on which the Christian draws in every time of his necessity. And there are times when all language is too feeble to express the strength of his gratitude, too cold to breathe out the warmth of his affection to the beloved of his soul.

To the soul that has been born from above, divine ordinances have a value and a relish, which they never had before. Formerly they were a burden, now they are his joy. Before the Sabbath was clothed in gloom, now it is

the brightest day of the seven. He feels as the holy Psalmist did: "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts!" The songs of Zion, how pleasant! the prayers, how solemn! the doctrine, how refreshing! the sacraments, what wells of salvation! The breath of prayer is sweet. "Behold, he prayeth," was the first token of the new birth in Paul. A prayerless Christian is a solecism in language, a contradiction in terms, a flat impossibility. The renewed soul delights to draw near to God, to enter within the veil, to lie down at the feet of Jesus, and to pour its groans and its tears into his ear and his heart.

The new birth is accompanied with new views of sin. Formerly sin was loved, cherished, and delighted in; rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongue. There was little sense of sin, little concern about it, little dread of committing it. The guilt of innumerable sins lay upon the soul with no more than a feather's weight. But now what a change! What discoveries the new-born soul has of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. It is seen to be an evil and a bitter thing—a filthy and abominable thing—an awfully dangerous thing.

true spiritual knowledge. Other books were preferred to the Bible; other truth was more relished than divine truth. God's word was a sapless, lifeless, tasteless thing. But how changed is all this when the man is renewed! Now the Bible is precious, very precious. David has well expressed the feeling of such an one towards the divine word when he pronounces it "sweeter than honey and the honey-comb." He delights in it. He has appetite for it. He has spiritual understanding of it. He has growth from it. He has security from it; it is the shield with which he wards off the fiery darts of the adversary. In fine, he rejoices in it as one that findeth great spoil.

The new man has new judgments concerning himself. He is no longer his own centre. He no longer claims any property in himself, nor assumes to be master of his own actions. He looks upon himself as belonging to God, and as bound to make it the great employment of his whole life to serve him, to advance his glory, to root out sinful habits, and to abound in holy living. A converted sinner often stands astonished at his former conduct. He wonders at his boldness in sin. He trembles at the remembrance of his former state. And to think what a change has been wrought in him, excites the liveliest gratitude to God for the riches of his abundant grace.

The man who has been created anew in Christ Jesus has new feelings towards Christians. The image of Christ in them makes them dear to him. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." This is Christ's own mark of discipleship. Every one that loveth is born of God. The Psalmist assures us that all his delight was in the saints, the excellent of the earth. The joy of Christian communion is a joy precious to the Christian's heart in proportion to the liveliness and vigor of divine grace in his own soul.

Sinners are regarded by the regenerate with emotions never before felt towards them. Compassion to sinners was a main feature in the character of Christ. This brought him from his throne. This clothed him in human flesh. This made him weep over Jerusalem. This bowed his head in death. This makes him wait upon sinners, knocking at the door of their hearts, till his locks are wet with the drops of the

night. All Christ's are like him. The same spirit dwells in them. The same heart throbs in their breast. While the wicked ways of sinners are abhorred, compassion, pity, tenderness, and love are felt towards their souls. Tears are wept over them in secret. Earnest prayers ascend for their conversion. Words of solemn warning and tender entreaty are addressed to them. In short, the feeling of the renewed soul towards all who are out of Christ is, "O, taste and see that the Lord is good."

The renewed man's estimate of the world is different from what it was before his conversion. Then the world was all smiles and roses. There was fascination in its money, fascination in its applause, fascination in its honors, fascination in its beauty, fascination in its gaieties, and fascination in its pleasures. It seemed a very paradise of sweets. How ardently the heart loved it! How eagerly the hands pursued it! How entirely the soul was engrossed by it! But now the charm is broken. Its false but dazzling colors are dashed out. Gold, fame, rank, power, beauty, and pleasure

Now it seems to him, as it truly is, the most valuable of all treasures, infinitely more precious than gold or rubies, because a happy or a miserable eternity depends upon the good or ill use he makes of it. The master's estimate of time is expressed in the solemn declaration: "I must work the work of him that sent me, while it is day; the night cometh." So does every true believer look at time.

The regenerate person has new impressions and new judgments of things unseen and eternal. Before he was born again, the vanities of time filled his thoughts, engaged his affections, engrossed his pursuits. The world and the things of the world were all in all to him. Eternity seldom crossed his mind, and when it did, the thought was quickly shaken off as an unwelcome intruder. But now the world of sense sinks, and the world of spirits rises in his esteem. Death, judgment, and eternity, with their endless awards of weal or woe, are frequently and strongly in his thoughts. They no longer appear to him as idle tales, in which he has little or no concern, but as living and stupendous realities, in which he is vitally, essentially, profoundly interested. Eternity flashes a light into his soul, which reveals the hideous deformity of sin, corrects the false representations of sense, and shows him how baseless are the claims of earthly gratification. Man's grand concern is with his eternal state. It is not this moment of mortal life, it is not this first brief stage of his existence, it is not this vision of an hour, that should engage his thoughts, command his affections, and call into vital and vigorous action the energies of his soul. No! it is what he is to be for ever; it is what God thinks of him, and what God will do with him in eternity. This is the great question; this is the grand concern; and so the renewed soul feels it to be, at least in his more serious and recollected moments.

Although outward reformation does not of itself constitute regeneration, yet such reformation is a uniform effect of it, and therefore essentially necessary to complete the proof that the change has taken place. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Religion is a divine life, a vital principle in the soul, of heavenly origin; and, therefore, it must have external manifestations, an outgrowth of holy activities. The seed being planted, the fruit will surely and

speedily appear. What saith the Scripture? "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God," 1 John iii. 9. Paul, in 1 Cor. vi. 11, speaks of Christians, though polluted and unholy before, yet, in their regeneration, as washed and sanctified by the Spirit of God. As, from the vital energy in the seed, the stem, leaves, buds, blossoms, and ripened fruit of the plant are evolved, so, from the living principle of grace in the heart, are developed in the life all the rich and clustering fruits of the Spirit —all those gracious activities which constitute holy living. This alteration in the life will be marked and conspicuous, when the openly profane and irreligious are new-born. But it is not confined to persons of that description. "A change will even take place in the most moral unconverted man, as soon as he is born from above. There are, perhaps, no gross sins, from which he needs to be purified; but he will become more spiritual in his conversation, more attentive to religious and relative duties, less eager in pursuit of the

change, in which the soul is convinced of sin, the understanding enlightened in the knowledge of God, the will renewed, the affections regulated, the body sanctified, and all the powers of the man directed to new and nobler objects. This wonderful change is instantaneously wrought, there being no delay in the transition from death to life, no intermediate state between the state of nature and the state of grace, between condemnation in sin and justification in the righteousness of Christ, between a righteous exposure to hell and a gracious title to heaven. The necessity for this change arises from the fact that all men are spiritually dead, and without tastes, or aptitudes, or even powers for spiritual employments and pleasures; and is impressively set forth and taught in holy Scripture. God the Holy Ghost is the sole author of this change, which he effects by the direct exertion of his almighty power; using, however, to this end, the truth revealed in the Bible, as the external means. Of all which the resulting consequence and the indubitable evidence is a complete revolution in the spiritual tastes and emotions, and a radical, pervading, and permanent reformation of the life; and this, however amiable the temper, however moral the deportment, however upright and useful, in a merely worldly point of view, the life may have previously been.

Are we asked as to the essence of this new life and the manner of its infusion into the soul? We candidly own our inability to explain, or even to conceive what it is, or how it is. But we avow an equal incompetency to conceive or explain what the essence or the origin of that life is, which pervades, moves, and animates this mortal body. We know the fact of our natural life, because we see and feel its effects in the phenomena of sensation, thought, volition, and action. In the same manner and with the same certainty, do we know the fact of our new spiritual life. We reason, judge, desire, hope, believe, repent, and act, as we never did before. Our thoughts are new; our aims are new; our motives are new; our emotions are new; our life is new. In these actings of the new, spiritual, and divine life, we have abundant evidence of its existence.

The Bible speaks of spiritual life just as it speaks of natural life, treating the one as a reality equally with the other.

A beautiful incident is related by Dr. Brownlee, in his Christian Youth's Book, showing how vigorous the former sometimes is amid the decay and wreck of the latter, even when reason, judgment, and memory have deserted the throne. An aged servant of God had sunk to an extreme mental imbecility. The scenes of his youth, which are ever the last to let go their hold upon the memory, had faded from his mind. Friends, children, and the dear partner of his life had, all alike, become strangers to him. Of his wife he declared, that he did not remember to have seen her. A friend, standing by the bedside of the dying saint, said to him, "Do you know who the Lord Jesus Christ is?" Instantly his mind rallied, and he replied, "O, yes; I know the Lord Jesus Christ; he has been my very dear Saviour these fifty years." Well does the learned and pious Doctor, in commenting on this incident, observe, that "spiritual life is a positive reality in the very essence of the soul, as much as any other inseparable or known quality or attribute of

unregenerate, there is no time for delay in seeking converting grace. Repent or perish is the divine sentence. The new birth or perdition is the alternative. Morality will not save you. Outward reformation will not save you. Baptism, church membership, external ordinances will not save you. It is of no avail to cry, "the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are we." This was the claim, this the reliance of the Pharisees of old, against whom the heaviest woes of damnation were denounced by the lips of the gentle, the loving, the gracious Saviour. If you are not the subjects of renewing grace you are yet in your sins, and, dying in that condition, you must "go away into everlasting punishment."

How stands the case, then, with you, reader? Are you conscious of a spiritual renovation? Have the illuminations of the Spirit pervaded your understanding, his divine energy subdued your will, his gentle breathings softened your heart? Do you feel the actings of the new life within you? Is that life quickened by the Spirit into active obedience and holy delight in God? Are you sensible of your new interest and pleasure in duty? Do you find your proper element in the service of God? Is Christ formed within you? Are his mind, his heart, and his life reproduced in yours? Does he live and walk in you? Have you crucified the flesh, with its affections and lusts? Does your heart, pierced with a sense of sin, like the rock smitten by the rod of God, send forth the waters of penitential grief? Is grace a living fountain within you of holy desires, holy aspirations, holy resolves, holy aims, and holy actions? Has a purer and nobler motive than human applause and worldly riches, even a desire of the divine approbation and the heavenly inheritance, taken possession of your soul? Are love to the Divine Being and regard to the divine authority the spring and the rule of your conduct? Though in the world, are you no longer of the world? Though mingling in its affairs and sensitive to its vicissitudes, do you, like patriarchs and prophets, declare plainly that you are seeking a heavenly country? If so, happy are you! Seek a complete consecration, an entire sanctification; aim at an abundant entrance and a lustrous crown. But if otherwise, suffer the word of solemn warning and affectionate entreaty.

Your state is bad, but it is not hopeless. Christ is able, Christ is willing to save to the uttermost. There is no guilt too great for him to cancel; no stains of sin too deep for him to wash out; no chains of Satan too strong for him to break asunder. Fly to his cross for refuge; seek from him the new heart. Infinite obligations press you to this; infinite compassion weeps over your insensibility; infinite mercy stoops to redeem you; infinite love wooes your return. Let fall at length the weapons of your rebellion. All that is great, all that is good, all that is lovely implore you to seek the regenerating and saving grace of God in Christ. Unconverted reader, receive the parting word which we address to you in all tenderness and fidelity, and may God, by his Spirit, impress it with saving power on your heart. It is this:—take with you to your homes, to your business, to your amusements, to your closets, to your most secret thoughts and self-communings, the words of our Saviour to Nicodemus, so solemn in their import, so startling by their energy, so tremendous and far-reaching in the

apostles immediately proposed the appointment of persons to supply their wants. They were overlooked; because unknown—not rejected, as though unentitled to share in the means that were appropriated to the relief of the necessitous. That large numbers both of the Hebrew and Hellenistic disciples were dependent for support on the daily distribution, was occasioned, doubtless, as suggested, chap. iv. 34, 35, by their remaining at Jerusalem, in consequence of the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and the events that followed, longer than they had anticipated. The money with which they went to the feast, being only adequate to the expenses of a short visit there, and the journey home, in their stay of weeks or months they were reduced to the necessity of looking to the common stock for a supply from day to day.

"Then the twelve having called to them the multitude of the disciples, said:- It is not pleasing (we do not approve it) that we should leave the word of God to serve tables. Look ye out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men, attested, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we will appoint to this business. But we will continue in prayer and the ministry of the word," vs. 24. They were to be selected by the brethren, but were to receive their authority from, or be inducted into their office by the apostles. The qualification for the office was to be, first, the attestation of the brethren. They were not to be unknown, nor of exceptionable character, but known, and of reputation for uprightness and piety. Next, they were to be full of the Holy Spirit, by which is meant that they were to be endowed with his miraculous gifts, such as inspiration, speaking with tongues, and working wonders; and thus were to be attested of God as well as men: and thirdly, they were also to be full of wisdom; that is, intelligence, good judgment, and experience; that they might be able to discharge the duties of their office with discernment, promptness, and skill.

"And the word (proposal) pleased the whole multitude. And they chose Stephen, a man, full of faith, and of the Holy Spirit, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch, whom they set before the apostles. And they having

prayed, placed on them the hands," vs. 5–7. Though the first six as well as the last are Greek names, it is not to be assumed that they were all Hellenists or foreign Jews, as it was common for individuals to have both a Hebrew and a Greek name. If they were all Hellenists, most of them, it is clear from their being attested by the church, had resided at Jerusalem a sufficient time to have become known as persons of virtue and piety.

"And the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples was multiplied greatly in Jerusalem, and a great throng of the priests obeyed the faith," vs. 8. By the increase of the word of God, is not meant so much probably that it grew in completeness by the revelation of new truths, and a fuller disclosure of the divine purposes, as that it advanced in the resistlessness of its evidence and power, was proclaimed by a greater number of teachers, and developed more fully its effects in those who received it. As conversions were multiplied, and miraculous gifts were more widely distributed to believers, the doctrine of Christ must

end at which he aimed; the spirit, the Spirit of God in his miraculous gifts by which the word spoken was confirmed.

"Then they suborned men who said, We have heard him speaking calumniatory words against Moses and God. And they moved the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and coming upon him, they seized and led him to the Sanhedrim," vs. 11, 12. The object of those foreign Jews in suborning witnesses was to excite the native Jews, people and rulers, against him, and thereby procure his arraignment before the Sanhedrim. What the contumelious words or expressions were which the purchased witnesses affirmed they had heard him utter against Moses and God, is seen from the accusation they presented to the Sanhedrim.

"And they set false witnesses who said, This man does not cease speaking words against the holy place and the law. For we have heard him saying that Jesus, that Nazarene, shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which were taught us by Moses," vs. 13, 14. Here the words spoken against the holy place, that is the temple, and the law, are the same as the contumelious words said to have been spoken against Moses and God; and they were held to be calumniatory, because they declared that Jesus, that Nazarene, would destroy the temple, and abolish the ritual instituted by the ministry of Moses. These subjects had undoubtedly already been disputed between those foreign Jews and Stephen, and the prophecy to which the witnesses referred, it may be presumed, was that of Christ, Matt. xxiv., repeated by Stephen, of the destruction of the temple and the city, the abolition thereby of the temple worship, and the dispersion of the people among the nations. And the falsehood of their testimony lay in the charge that that prophecy implied that God was about for ever to desert his people and contradict and renounce his promises to them of redemption from their enemies by the Messiah; while Stephen maintained, doubtless, according to Christ's prediction, that the final deliverance of Israel was to take place after the destruction of the temple, and a fresh exile of the nation for a period among the Gentiles. They held, then, it is clear,

1. That no such delay could consist with the verification of God's promises.

2. Also that it was inconsistent with the sanctity of the temple that it should be consigned to destruction, and its site desecrated by an appropriation to other uses.

3. And likewise that the people had not committed and would not commit such crimes against God as to draw on them so awful a punishment as the destruction of their temple, the abolition of their public worship, and their exile among the Gentiles.

4. And, finally, they seem to have maintained that none of God's genuine prophets and messengers were likely to be rejected and persecuted by those to whom they were sent, and argued from that that Jesus and his disciples could not be God's messengers.

All these points lie couched in their charge, and were debated by them undoubtedly; as, had they not held them, they could not have regarded it as a detraction of Moses and God to predict the abolition of the Mosaic ritual, the destruction of the temple, and a long exile of the nation. For if it was not inconsistent with God's perfections and

from the fact that they are the points of which he treats in his address before the Sanhedrim. For he shows, first, that long delays had taken place in the fulfilment of God's promises to the patriarchs and prophets: secondly, that the great patriarchs and prophets with whom God made the covenants, to whom he revealed the law, and whom he made the chief instruments of the most distinguished blessings to his people, were hated, maligned, and persecuted, because of their relationship to him, and utterance of the revelations of which they were made the channels: thirdly, that places consecrated to God had no such sanctity as the Hellenists imagined, but might be deserted by him and appropriated to other purposes: and, fourthly, that the Israelites had committed offences against him that made them objects of his wrath, and drew on them the curse of slaughter, oppression, and exile. The perception of this correlation of the general branches of his discourse to the points that are embraced in their accusation, relieves his narrative and reasoning from the obscurity and irrelevancy with which some have thought them chargeable, and shows them to be suited to the occasion and worthy of the wisdom for which he was distinguished.

"And all who sat in the Sanhedrim looking steadfastly at him, saw his face, as if the face of an angel," vs. 15. The point of resemblance was not in form or expression; as that would imply an alteration of his features, but in a supernatural irradiation probably, and glory. It was a signal, therefore, that he was, like Moses, God's prophet, and should have awed the Sanhedrim into the abandonment of their murderous schemes.

Chapter vii. "And the high-priest said: Are these things so?" vs. 1. This was addressed to Stephen, and was a call on him to respond to those accusations. The first branch of his reply, is directed to the objection that such a delay as the destruction of the temple and city and the exile of the nation would involve, was inconsistent with God's promise of redeeming them by the Messiah, and would preclude its fulfilment. And he meets it by showing that a delay of centuries took place, and centuries filled with disasters, oppressions, and miseries, before even the great promise to Abraham, the father of the nation, of giving his seed posses-

sion of the sacred land, was accomplished. "And he said, Men, brethren, and fathers hear: The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham, being in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran, and said unto him, Go out from this thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I will show thee. Then going out from the land of the Chaldeans he dwelt in Charran, and thence after his father died he removed into this land, in which you now dwell. And he did not give him inheritance in it, nor a foot-breadth; and he promised to give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, he not having a child. But God spake to him thus, that his seed shall sojourn in a foreign land, and they [the inhabitants of that land] shall enslave it, and shall evil entreat it four hundred years. And the nation which shall enslave it, I will judge, said God, and after these [events] they shall go out, and shall serve me in this place. And he gave him the covenant of circumcision. And so (in this new relation) he begat Isaac, and circumcised him on the eighth day, and Isaac Jacob, and Jacob the twelve patriarchs." vs. 2–8. The

ment in freedom and peace in Palestine, would not at the appointed time be accomplished.

He next shows, on the one hand, that Joseph, a prophet, was persecuted and sold into slavery on that account; and on the other, that though afterwards exalted to great authority in Egypt, he was not the instrument of giving Jacob and his family possession of Canaan, but, instead, of drawing them to Egypt, and preparing the way for their subjection there to slavery.

"And the patriarchs envying Joseph, sold him into Egypt; and God was with him, and delivered him out of all his afflictions, and gave him favor and wisdom before Pharaoh, King of Egypt; and he constituted him chief over Egypt and all his house. And a famine came in the whole land of Egypt and Canaan, and great distress; and our fathers found no sustenance. And Jacob hearing that there was corn in Egypt sent our fathers first; and at the second (time) Joseph was made known to his brethren, and Joseph's kindred became known to Pharaoh. And Joseph sending, called to him his father Jacob and his whole lineage, in souls seventy-five. And Jacob went down into Egypt; and he died and our fathers; and they were carried to Sychem, and placed in the sepulchre which Abraham bought for a price of silver of Emmor of Sychem," vs. 9–16.

Here the facts affirmed are, first, that Joseph, a prophet, was persecuted by his brethren, because of the prophecies he uttered of their becoming subordinate to him; and next, that though exalted to great power in Egypt, he was not the instrument of putting his kindred in possession of Canaan, but, instead, of verifying the prediction that they were to be reduced to slavery in a foreign land. And the relevancy of these to the points disputed by Stephen's accusers, lay in their showing, on the one side, that the persecution of Christ by the nation was no proof that he was not the Messiah; nor the persecution of his disciples any proof that they were not the true ministers of God; and on the other, that the destruction of the temple, the breaking up of the Hebrew Commonwealth, and the re-vassalage of the nation to the Gentiles were to be no proof that the promise of their redemption and restoration to their land under the Messiah would not in due time be fulfilled.

He now reminds them of the history of Moses, through whom they received the law, who was rejected by the people in his character as a prophet, and obliged to flee to the wilderness to save himself from dangers to which their aversion and resentment exposed him :—

" And as the time drew near of the promise which God swore to Abraham, the people increased and were multiplied in Egypt, until another king arose who did not know Joseph. He dealing subtilely with our race, maltreated our fathers to make them expose their young children, in order that they might not be preserved alive. At that time Moses was born, and was very fair; who was nourished three months in the house of his father. But being exposed, the daughter of Pharaoh took and nourished him for herself as a son. And Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. And he was mighty in words and deeds. And when the time of forty years was completed to him, it came into his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel; and seeing one wronged, he defended him, and did vengeance for him who was wronged, smiting the Egyptian. And he

them. And now come, I will send thee into Egypt. This Moses whom they denied, saying, Who constituted thee leader and judge,—THIS God sent by the hand of the angel who appeared to him in the bush. He led them forth, performing miracles and signs in the land of Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness forty years. He is the Moses who said to the children of Israel, a prophet will the Lord God raise up unto you of your brethren, like me. Him ye shall hear. He it is who was in the congregation in the wilderness with the angel who spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers, who received the living oracles to give to us; and to whom our fathers would not be obedient, but repelled him and turned back in their hearts unto Egypt; saying to Aaron, make to us Gods who shall go before us: for that Moses who led us forth out of the land of Egypt, we know not what has happened to him," vs. 17–40.

The great facts presented here are, first, that Moses, the great prophet of the nation whom God had chosen to conduct the people out of Egypt, through whom he had given them their laws, and with whom God conversed face to face, instead of accomplishing the deliverance of the nation at once, on his reaching a mature age, was not allowed to enter on it till forty years had passed, and then, after forty years spent in the wilderness, only conducted them to the borders of the promised land: and the object was to show that the delays the vengeance of God was now to occasion, would be no barrier to the final redemption of the nation; and next, that they, when that great prophet first presented himself to them as the leader by whom God was to deliver them, sternly and insolently repelled him, denied his authority, and forced him to fly for safety to the desert for forty years; and that was exhibited as a parallel to the rejection of which the nation had now been guilty of Jesus of Nazareth, though he had shown by innumerable proofs that he was the Son of God. Christ's being denied and put to death was no more a demonstration that he was not the Messiah, than the denial and scorn which Moses met, was that he was not appointed by God to be the deliverer of the nation from their thraldom in Egypt.

Stephen now proceeds to show that the Israelites of that

age not only rejected Moses as their leader, and substituted a golden calf in his place, but that they apostatized from God also to the worship of idols.

"And they made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice to the idol, and rejoiced in the work of their hands. And God turned and gave them up to serve the army of heaven [sun, planets, and stars], as it is written in the book of the prophets. Have ye offered sacrifices and offerings to me in the wilderness forty years, house of Israel? And ye took up the tent of Moloch and the star of your god Remphan, the images which ye made, to worship them; and I will carry you away beyond Babylon." Vs. 41–43, and Amos, vs. 25–27.

They had not only made a calf and presented victims to it, but they had exhibited such a passion for deities made by themselves that God had abandoned them to the worship of the sun, moon, and stars; and they had carried a tent of Moloch, containing an image supposed to be the representative of the sun; and the star of the god Rem-

will ye build for me, saith the Lord, or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these?" vs. 44–50.

The point here proved is that no place had the inviolable sanctity which the Jews ascribed to the temple and its site. When God appeared to Moses at the bush, the ground on which the prophet stood was holy; but not after the vision. When the tabernacle was erected in the wilderness, that was holy, and continued so down to the time of Solomon, wherever it was stationed; but not the several places in which it had been set up. They lost their sanctity on the removal of the tent from which they drew it. And at the erection of the temple, it was expressly acknowledged by Solomon that the Most High, whom the heaven cannot contain, could not dwell in the house he had builded. It was only to be a place towards which God would look. And Stephen's object in this recital was to confute the pretence that because the temple was consecrated to God he could not destroy it, nor suffer it to be destroyed by men.

That this construction of the discourse is correct, Stephen now made clear by the direct assertion that in their apostasy from God, and their persecution of his messengers, there was an exact parallel between those whom he was addressing and their revolting fathers.

"Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers, so ye. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? And they killed those who foretold respecting the coming of the righteous [one], of whom now ye have become the betrayers and murderers; who received the law through the ministry of angels; and did not keep it;" [as you have heard the glad-tidings of salvation from the Son of God himself, and have not accepted them, but have rejected and put him to death], vs. 51–53.

Here is, thus, an explicit announcement that those whom he was addressing presented in their spirit and conduct towards God and his prophets, an exact parallel to their rebellious fathers. As their fathers had always resisted the Holy Spirit, so had the priests and rulers before whom Stephen was arraigned; as their fathers had persecuted the prophets, and put them to death who foretold the coming of the Messiah, so their sons had now betrayed and murdered the

Messiah himself. And he was about to declare, it is probable, that as God had punished their fathers whose hands were stained with the blood of the prophets by delivering them to the power of their enemies, so he was about to punish the rejecters and murderers of the Messiah, by delivering them to the Romans, who would drive such of them as escaped the sword into exile, and doom their descendants to dispersion till Christ's second coming; but, interrupted by the clamors of the assembly, he was compelled to close his address. Such is undoubtedly the true bearing of his discourse; as contemplated thus, every part of it had a direct reference to the pretexts and assumptions of his accusers, and impressively confuting them, vindicated the great purpose of God now announced of visiting the nation again with destroying judgments because of the rejection and crucifixion of Christ.

"But they hearing these expressions were cut with a saw in their hearts, and gnashed their teeth on him," vs. 54. Instead of being touched with the sense of their guilt and

"And they stoned Stephen, invoking and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit. And kneeling he cried with a loud voice, Lord, do not set this sin to them. And saying this he fell asleep," vs. 59, 60. What a sublime contrast his self-possession, trust, and pity to his murderers, presented to their infuriate passions! He fell asleep, unagitated, unmoved by suffering, unruffled by resentment. The last pulse that throbbed in his spirit towards Christ was trust; the last wave of emotion that swept through his heart towards man, was compassion for those who were imbruing their hands in his blood.

Art. V.—The Facts of Geology consistent with the Revealed History of the Creation.

BY REV. D. C. M'LAREN, D.D., GENEVA.

Geology, in the Natural History it has framed, attributes to every animal and vegetable of which it treats a beginning, and a beginning prior to the formation of the earliest deposit in which its remains are found. The beginning, however, in the primitive organized memorials that attest it, is a mystery which physical science, from its own resources, whether of fact or principle, cannot explain. The law of reproduction may account for the existence of individuals in a specific series, springing from one and the same stock; but that law does not extend beyond its appropriate sphere, to the original stock itself, and cannot account for the rise and structure of the first that was, in any given series. The physiologist, intimately conversant as he may be with the phenomena and secrets of life in nature as it now is, has no evidence, no record that existing nature has received accessions of new forms or subjects of life, and he can supply from analogy no light that will reach the dark spot where the geologist comes to the beginning. It is the mystery not of a speculation, but of an ascertained and veritable fact, diverse from all other geological facts, inasmuch as it necessarily suggests the question of organization. What can the geologist make of this fact? How can he

solve this question? It is ever before him in the field of his toilsome search. In his retrospective survey of ancient nature he meets with shrubs, trees, fish, birds, reptiles, and beasts of the field, which had no predecessors of their kind —he looks through the several periods of the earth's supposed duration, and sees period separated from period by broad chasms, which no law of propagation can span and where no trace of life can be seen. In whatever line of organized existence he may pursue his search into the vastness and wonders of past duration, however low or high the line may be, leading to the first mushroom or the first mastodon, terminating in the first of any genera or species in the water, in the air, or in the dry-land—by whatever avenue he arrives at the beginning of organization and life, he finds the same mystery of mysteries, the same dark deep. How did those various countless living structures whose beginning is a geologically established fact begin to be? Whence did they derive their subsistence, their wondrous forms, and still more wondrous life? This is a question

science can more conclusively demonstrate than that they all had a beginning. The infidel who, in this late age of the world, would attempt falling back on the fiction of an 'infinite series' would be laughed to scorn. They began to be —but how? No true geologist holds by the development hypothesis, and there is but one other alternative. They began to be through the miracle of creation. Even those geologists who maintain that there were many creations or eras of creation, allow the intervention of creation on a large scale."

What we in this connexion would raise into deserved prominency, as bearing on this introductory argument, and on the end in view in the subsequent exposition, is this:—that the idea of creation, the knowledge of this primary fact in Natural History, is derived from divine revelation. Being in harmony with nature, and illustrating nature, it is a truth for which in its entireness physical science should allow ample room, and a truth worthy of all honor from geology, which, in honoring this, honors itself. Still, it did not originate in geology. It is, indeed, doubtful whether geological science by deduction, would have reached it, and brought it within the grasp of human knowledge—certainly not with the precision, comprehensiveness, and freedom from error, with which this great truth is stated and taught in the Bible. If we would then know what creation, the creation, is, we must search for the whole of it where geologists find some of it; and where they may find more than they have yet appropriated, as they may have occasion and disposition to do, when they shall have drawn out into light all the information contained in facts already known, and in others yet unseen with which the unexplored portions of the earth's crust are stored. True science, being true to itself and to truth, must increase in truth. The first fruits give promise of plenty. An eclipse may come on, but it will pass off. The new moon, after a little, will be the full moon, shedding in harmony with all the stars, the light of heaven into the night of earth, to give good knowledge to men for the increase and confirmation of their faith in the faithful Creator.

To form a just estimate of creation it is necessary to contemplate this divine truth, this stupendous fact, as it is unfolded in the sacred Scriptures, in which are revealed not

only the work itself, its period, progress, extent, and originality, but also the omnipotent agent who wrought it in the exercise of his own wisdom, power, and will. We cannot do anything else, or less, than this, consistently with the dictates of descriptive, and the admissions of speculative geology. Taking then this course, placing ourselves amid the developments of supernatural revelation, and resting our thoughts on the all-sufficiency of the Creator, we have, aside from all express testimony, ground enough for the conclusion that he might have created in one brief limited period all those living bodies, whose remains, or the remains of whose descendants, are entombed in the rocks of the earth. Their instantaneous creation, as the direct effect of the First Cause, cannot, in view of the divine infinitude, be deemed incredible—may not the same reasoning be applied to the material earth itself?—could not He, who hung the earth upon nothing, make it out of nothing? By the word of his power it has continued and consisted for the space of six thousand years; had He not power to cause it to begin and

overwhelming ocean were last confined to their present limits and level—when the dry land first appeared in its present configuration, without a living plant or animal on its surface to relieve the startling dreariness of its scenery, its bare or broken rocks, its gorges, boulders, slime ruins and death, would not the universal phenomena exhibited on the face of such an earth, demonstrate, or at least indicate, that the earth itself was an immense mysterious remain, and consequently bore, in its desolate state, a relation, analogous to that of organic remains, to a former and better condition? May it not, then, be descriptively restored and remodelled after the pattern of a finished earth, shown in holy Scripture? Change is not beginning, nor modification creation; and any history or theory of the earth, any physical science which mistakes or substitutes the former for the latter, must be fundamentally erroneous; any superstructure built on this foundation, however good its materials or magnificent its workmanship, must be taken down, and rebuilt on the foundation laid in creation, before the truth of nature or of Scripture can own it and love it as a home. The astronomy of science was not for long ages the astronomy of the natural heavens—so the geology of science may not be the geology ingrained in the rocky crust of the earth. It is the design of this essay to show that between Scripture and nature there is no controversy about creation, as there is none about anything else; and this endeavor, founded on belief, may serve as an apology to excuse, if it should lack the strength of a plea to justify those who believe, that God created the earth and its fulness in the space of six days. Scientific geology demands vastly more time than this. It affirms that there are in the earth as a whole, proofs of a self-formative process without marks of a beginning or known limits to its antiquity; or, that there was a long succession of changes effected by natural laws and existing second causes, which eventually brought the earth into its present state. Interpretations, several of them obsolete and all insufficient, have been framed to prove, that this theory of the earth is scriptural. The six days have been turned and stretched into six periods of indefinite length. Still geology recognises no such periods. Its own periods, divisive of past duration,

have not in any one of them anything peculiar or characteristic to suit any one of the days of Genesis. It puts changes and natural laws in the place of creation without them; and herein departs from Scripture in a divergence too wide to be reconciled by any interpretation in harmony with the plain tenor and express statements of the inspired narrative. Thus science excludes from its record, in regard to the habitable world, *Creation* as well as the *Deluge*—the two most momentous events in the Natural History of the earth. This decision is not final. An appeal may be carried from the halls of science to the court of stern nature, a tribunal before which science will not refuse to bow, and in doing so, bow to a tribunal far higher. If in the records of nature there is evidence, taken down years ago, that what in modern times are called "geological changes," were subsequent to the existence of a finished earth, and on nature's rocky shelves well preserved specimens in abundance, are laid up, as memorials of the beauty, fertility, and grandeur of that ancient earth—if nature can show in inorganic

complete throughout, in all its parts, and in all the elements that rendered it a material reality. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and the earth, and all there was of it in the first stage of its subsistence, "was without form and void." This description is negative, but expressive; and admits of no limitation or exception in regard to the subject of which it is predicated. The earth was the same identically that it was on the seventh day; but it was at first in a condition, externally and internally, the reverse of what it was when finished. It was first without beauty, order, or symmetry of parts—not only devoid of forms of life, but of material forms of any kind by organization or crystallization; no component particle or portion of the earth, in its primordial state, having the complete, separate nature, full, distinctive properties, affinities, or combinations for which it was destined. All the elementary substances constituting the earth in the course of its beginning, crude and immature, were confusedly interspersed and commingled in a plastic or fluid state; water, itself still imperfect, being the diffused menstruum that gave the character of fluidity to the whole mass. What it was then, or what it afterwards became, it was not by any cause or law inherent in itself, but solely by divine energy; "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Whatever idea may be held of the continuance of this state, it is certain, that the earth was not then, at first, a luminous expanse of gas, nor a red-hot globe of elements melting with fervent heat. "For darkness was upon the face of the deep," and that darkness was not from the privation, but from the non-existence of light, till God said, "Let there be light, and there was light." Farther, as the earth was at first, so it remained in the midst of a universal vacuum without an atmosphere, unto the second day, when God made the firmament, or aerial heavens. After the creation of light and air, the earth abode still formless and void, without change, internal or superficial, unto the coming of the third day, on which the earth was prepared for the herbs and trees, which were on the same day brought forth. Then an entire change took place, and chaos ceased. *The second* point that calls for particular notice is, that the change which took place in the chaotic earth, as a whole,

on the third day, was a final creative change of all its p
by the creating power of God, in the formation of the
land, in all its extent and depth, with all its essential c
stituents, contents, properties, and laws in fitness for
manifold uses and ends, and in the simultaneous format
of seas with all their connexions, fountains, and propert
with all essentially pertaining to the same. This primit
and permanent division of the globe into land and wa
God made in creation, and at once. The separation of
earthy from the aqueous was not the operation of any na
ral law, or an effect from the action of water; God spa
and it was done, independently of and antecedently to
laws of nature. This is the plain sense of the inspired st
ment. God said, and it was so; and that is all we n
look to. The earth was no longer without form and v
Before this there were no seas, lakes, rivers, springs, mi
or rain, no pure, unmingled water. Before this there w
no mountains or plains, hills or valleys, no islands, no s
rocks, or minerals. But now the whole earth, withou

order and work of creation, every plant was a plant before it was in the earth, and every herb an herb before it grew; so everything below the surface at that time, soil, gold, silver, precious stones, granite, or whatever it might be, had its creation and beginning not from any second cause but from God. God's mark was upon it, a mark which rough change may mar, but time will not destroy, nor nature disown. *The only other point* we shall notice, and one presented with great prominency in the scriptural narrative, is the pre-eminent physical excellency that crowned the primitive earth and its organized fulness. Such perfection was the prevailing and conspicuous characteristic, not only of the finished physical earth as a whole, but also of everything in particular, gaseous, fluid, or solid, organic or inorganic, animate or inanimate. The strong and deep significancy of this fact is evinced by the repeated affirmation of it in this condensed account of the creation work. It is not said of the earth as it was at first "without form and void," that it was good, for there was nothing then in it ultimate and complete. But the light was good. The atmosphere was good, in its temperature, qualities, influence, and freedom from noxious intermixtures. All collections, streams, and fountains of water were good, the water itself being so, sufficient and fit for its many ends. The dry land was good, its face and features everywhere beautiful. Its gold and other metals, in grains, masses, or veins, were all good. Its soil, from the sea-shore to the mountain tops, was very good, of the requisite depth, of the right texture, and of exuberant richness—every variety having in it the component and congruous elements of a perfect soil, in due proportions, without any preponderance of one ingredient to the exclusion or detriment of another. We might infer from the vegetative power and inexhaustible resources of such a soil that the vegetation it sustained was in quality and quantity, and in every respect good; "and the earth brought forth grass and herb, yielding seed after its kind; and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind; and God saw that it was good." This, in few words, characterizes the vegetation, which covered the whole earth at first, and (for hundreds of years after) enriched and beautified it. The garden of Eden was only the chief gem of many similar

gems of beauty in the gorgeous every-day dress of the original earth. The trees that waved in its majestic forests, or scattered their fruits and perfumes over its fields—the grasses of every kind that matted its pastures—the stately shrubbery, and far-stretching vines, that shaded its rivers or encircled its seas, were all on a scale of magnificence of which modern Botany can furnish no specimens. As was the flora so was the fauna of the old world. Whatever walked, or flew, or crawled, or swam, every living creature, of every size, shape, or structure, simple or complex, large or diminutive, was good and perfect in its kind. Amid the exuberant riches and superabundant plenty on the land and in the sea, animals of the largest dimensions and of enormous strength, birds, fishes, and reptiles, and beasts, might have fared well, which in our land or water would starve and become extinct, or bring to extinction other animals more useful to man. The universal extent and high degree of physical perfection that reigned in the earth is again affirmed in the close of the creation record: "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good."

2d. That God made the land with its included minerals and rocks, and the sea with its solid bottom, simultaneously and at once.

3d. That universal physical perfection pervaded the original earth and its organized living fullness. Does nature, the earth as it is, conflict or concur with the Scriptures as thus interpreted in regard to these facts?

I. Geology cannot tell how matter or the material world originated. In all its researches and discoveries it has not discovered the beginning. That is far off in the past at an immense unmeasured distance, shrouded in mist and mystery. Geology has a *modern* period—before that, a secondary, and then a palæozoic with its limit in the first appearance of life on the earth; but it has no primary period, nor has it found anything in the long long ages that preceded the periods of life and death that can with propriety be so called. The term primary, even in its application to granite rock, is now discarded as geologically unmeaning. It has no period in which chaos rested or worked. It describes a multitude and succession of changes; but these are changes of pre-existing matter affecting the exterior of the existing globe. In no kind or particle of matter, solid or liquid, can geological scrutiny detect any innate principle of self-organization. Wherever the geologist follows his vocation, on the surface of the earth among its boulders and gravel-beds; or into its depths among the stones of emptiness and the shadow of death, wherever he may pick up or dig out a fossil, he is, in the earth's history, at the bottom of an ocean of which he knows not the bounds or the beginning. He knows it is an ocean—may be the Atlantic and Pacific united as one. But can he trace by the track of any natural law that ocean to its fountain-head? All the solid matter now forming the stratified rocks on the whole face of the earth, was in existence in some locality before the first patch of it was deposited. How did all that matter begin? Whence its being? The sea did not treat it, and does not own it as its offspring, and the meanest particle of it will not disclose to the most pressing inquirer the hidden secret of its birth. Let the geologist, straitened and unsatisfied amid actual phenomena, wander into the boundless regions of hypothetical phenomena. Boil the

ocean into vapor—melt the earth, its minerals and rocks, into fluidity. Still this operation merely changes the condition, not the substance of matter. No action of water, heat, gas, or electricity can, singly or combined, make that to exist which was not in some form before, or change things essentially different into one another. Earth will remain earth—and metal, still metal. It is the boast of geology that it is a science of facts. To a certain extent this is true. But conjectures, though within the limits of possibility, are not facts—nor worthy of notice as testimony for the ascertainment or confirmation of truth. Geology has failed to adduce actual facts as samples to prove that natural laws or second causes produced the material earth, or any portion of the matter that enters into its constitution. The reason of this failure is, that there is in nature no impress of such laws, no traces of such an operation, not so much as ripple marks to betoken the former movement of such a cause. No part of the earth has the appearance of being a deserted workyard, where things are lying in confusion, and incomplete in different stages of structure.

the Creator—the argument implying that He is the God of order not of confusion. In the wonderful changes recorded in the stratified rocks, and in the second causes that produced them, there was in truth a special interposition of divine power and oversight. It by no means follows, however, that these changes, affecting only the surface of the earth, were creation.

II. The second point on which nature does not contradict, but rather verifies the common scriptural interpretation, is, that the two great natural divisions of the globe, land and water, were created simultaneously by the immediate power of God alone. If there are in nature no traces of the workings of natural laws having their effect in the complete and perfect beginning which nature presents amid all evidences of causes productive of change, in this case the naturalist may not acknowledge the agency of a supernatural cause, but he can draw no argument from nature against it. Both land and water have been subject to change—the former passively, and the latter actively. But even in the light in which geology portrays these changes they all were for the time being disastrous to all living creatures within their range. In the very recent drift period, since the present continents were formed into the shape, and the mountains in the height they now have, an ocean overwhelmed and destroyed everything. The tertiary period saw the first and last of a magnificent race of Pachiderms and Mammals far in advance of any now on the earth.

The secondary period was distinguished for the monstrous land reptiles and sea monsters that enlivened the earth in those weary ages in which they became extinct. The close of the Palæozoic period witnessed the destruction of the most splendid growth of shrubbery and forest that sunlight ever smiled on. Had not an acknowledged creation interfered to remedy the evils produced by these repeated diluvial catastrophes, the whole earth would now be nothing but a dismal solitude of desolation; and the land of our own State would be still, what it was in early Silurian times, since which all that it has of improvement it gained from the hand of the Creator, or of his creatures. Let the geologist go still further to the early dawn of the most an-

cient period of change. Let him follow the footprints of stratification to its first and faintest impress, when he must stop, with nothing within the compass of his vision but sea and granite in close and quick fellowship, and will he be able to discern in the soft calm face of the one, or in the hard calm face of the other, any difference in their age? Looking at the broad ocean by the light of the sun or of geology, has any one discovered any proofs in anything essentially pertaining to it, to contradict its instantaneous creation? Looking at the solid granite, the naked body of the earth stripped of the mantle which the busy sea threw over it; can the most exact science detect any marks in its composition or structure by which to determine its age?

Geologists cannot, by its mineral traits, distinguish granite rocks of the earliest period from those of the latest, millions of years after, according to geologic chronology. They of course are not competent to decide that the unstratified crystalline granite of the earth is, any of it, more than 6000 years old. A witness who cannot tell whether a person is six months old or sixty years is not competent to testify

the aid of a miracle, would have far less labor in accounting in a natural way for a quantity of water sufficient to deluge the whole earth for a year or so. We need say little about this central heat; but admitting its existence, the question rises, was it, could it ever be availing, for the ends to which it is theoretically applied—that is, for the formation of granite rock and the subsequent upheaval of its masses and mountains? The conditions necessary to its formation are thus described by Sir Charles Lyell, in his *Elements:* "All the various kinds of granite are supposed to be of igneous origin; the granites have been formed at great depths in the earth, and have cooled and crystallized slowly under enormous pressure."—Vol. ii. 325. This, by the candid avowal of its most able advocate, is only a supposition, although its assumed truth occupies a fundamental place in geological science. Is it true? 1st. There are tracts in almost every country, and in some countries extensive areas in which granite is the surface rock, or lies at no great depth from the surface. As it is, in those localities, it is destitute of the incumbent pressure which the igneous hypothesis requires for its formation. To meet this difficulty the hypothesis of denudation is framed. Those who choose to be put off with conjectural special pleading of this kind, may deem it reasoning; but it cannot be expected that Scriptural interpretation will heed the clamorous claims of a denudation which cannot trace its own tracks in any evidence of the disposition it made of the great depth of matter which it professes to have removed.

2d. This internal heat in the use made of it, first to keep the granite matter melting hot, and then to upheave it when it cannot be kept from cooling into solidity, has this characteristic property—that as its power to do the former abates, its power to do the latter is augmented; as it becomes weaker it becomes stronger, its fervent intensity less, but its expansive force greater. Granite is manufactured in the gradual passing of its constituents from a fluid to a solid state, from hotness to coldness. This work cannot begin except at great depths, and under the enormous weight of something, which cannot be kept from cooling and cannot be upheaved; yet, after the cooling process has penetrated deeper and added to all the former weight a mass of genuine granite sufficient

for mountains and whole continents, still, after all this loss by radiation and conduction, the heat has expansive energy enough to raise the whole upward for miles. This is a property not common to heat above ground, and the hypothesis in this respect seems to contradict itself. Not only so, but

3d. The earth, under its despotic control, does not appear to have been acquainted, except very superficially, with the law of gradual refrigeration, which prevails in other heated bodies of smaller dimensions. Common heat, real caloric, like light, has an inveterate inbred inclination to be roving, it is ever on the go. But not so with the hypothetical geological heat; it loves its ancient native home too well to leave it. From stirring movements, it made somewhere towards the beginning of countless ages before our times, it seemed to be on the point of going off rapidly. Again and again afterwards, it gave signs of an intent of that kind, and during a long interval from the era which the chalk marked on the rocks, and ending, no one can tell when or how, the general quietude betokened that the earth had got

once to sink below the lighter, and sink to the bottom of the hot abyss if the rest of its contents were lighter; and in the consolidation of any portion of the mass by cooling, there would remain some indelible marks of the gravitating movement. Mr. Lyell in accounting for the fact, that where Trachite and Basalt are found together in volcanic districts, the former, the lighter, rock occupies a position below the latter, which is heavier, admits the justice of the following reason for it: "The minerals which abound in basalt are of greater specific gravity than those composing the felspathic lavas: thus, for example, hornblende, augite, olevine, are each more than three times the weight of water, whereas common felspar, albite, and Labrador felspar, have each scarcely more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the specific gravity of water. If, therefore, a large quantity of rock be melted up in the bowels of the earth by volcanic heat, the denser ingredients of the boiling fluid will sink to the bottom, and the lighter, remaining above, will be first propelled upward to the surface by the expansive power of gases."—Elements, ii. 247. If the contents of the volcanic reservoir had cooled and hardened without an eruption, in the rock thus slowly formed, hornblende would not be found in crystals, joined and intermixed with crystals of felspar; but the former being the heaviest by one-fifth, would be found at the bottom. If, therefore, Sienite granite, in which hornblende takes the place of mica, had ever been in a fluid state, the same natural law would have prevailed, and the same arrangements of its constituent parts would have followed; but it has no such appearance. The same may be affirmed of the granites in which shorl or augite, hyposthene, or diallage, forms a part: all which are at least one-fifth heavier than felspar. Zircon, which is one-third heavier than either of these, abounds in Norway sienite, and this, and garnets of about the same gravity, are found in the primitive rocks of our state. Had the granites in which these various crystallized substances occur been melted, these would not have rested in the relative position in which they are now fixed. The same may be said of various metals imbedded in it. From this, it is evident that the formation of granite in the condition which the hypothesis contemplates, is a natural impossibility.

5th. Furthermore, in that condition or mode, neither stra-

tified nor granitic rocks could be ever formed in the relation they now universally exhibit in the immediate contact of the former with the latter, as the basis on which they rest. Stratification could not have begun without a solid foundation of granite, and the consolidation of granite could not have begun without a weighty superstructure of stratified rocks. The one class of rocks, therefore, could not begin before the other. To suppose that the bed of the first ocean in which the deposition of sediment began was made up of rude volcanic rocks, and that beneath this crust as it deepened and thickened, granite was at length formed, is a supposition without reason for it in nature or probability. For if volcanic rocks had ever occupied such an intermediate position, they would have been likely to remain, being well protected by stratified rock above and by granite rocks below. But there is no interposing rock of that kind, nor evidence that there ever was. The metamorphic hypothesis has here a word to say, and represents that the internal heat, after a long fit of sinking and faintness, revived with strength enough to de-

is demonstrated by the general character of organic remains, animal and vegetable, indicating in the superiority of the animals and plants which they represent, the surpassing excellency of the earth in which they flourished; the splendid cosmos which, according to the apostle Peter, being overflowed with water, perished.

Art. VI.—Dr. Sprague's Annals of the American Episcopal Pulpit.

Annals of the American Pulpit; or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of Various Denominations, from the early Settlement of the Country to the close of the Year Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-five. With Historical Introductions. By William B. Sprague, D.D. Vol. V. Episcopalian. New York: R. Carter and Brothers, 1859.

This volume, devoted to clergymen of the Episcopal church, is distinguished, like its predecessors, for the ease, tastefulness, and beauty of its narratives and delineations of character, for the long series it presents of delightful portraits of men eminent for gifts, cultivation, piety, and usefulness; and for its candor and superiority to denominational biases. In all in it that proceeds from Dr. Sprague's pen, the same discrimination is seen, the same impartiality, the same largeness of views, the same appreciation of worth, as in his former volumes: and he has enjoyed the aid of a body of judicious contributors, whose letters add largely by their freshness and point to the charm of the volume. It is instructive and refreshing to trace a branch of the evangelical church through such a period, and see on the one hand the care God takes of his flock, in raising up gifted, holy, and laborious men to gather them into his fold, and nourish, guide, and shelter them amidst the dangers to which they are exposed; and on the other, the manner in which he bestows blessings on his faithful shepherds, and makes them to their people the objects of respect and affec-

tion, as well as the ministers of mercy. It is not always in those of high grades of talent, or occupying conspicuous stations, that the fairest and loftiest forms of the Christian minister are seen. The most charming examples of truthfulness, wisdom, and fidelity, crowned with special signals of the divine favor, are often in humble positions, and scarcely attract the eye of the world.

The number of Episcopal ministers in this country up to the middle of the last century was but small, partly from the cast of persons, dissenters chiefly from the national church, who had, in the preceding hundred years, migrated from Great Britain, and partly from the want of arrangements here for the induction of candidates into the sacred office. The colonies being attached to the see of London, all here who were desirous of entering the ministry, were obliged to cross the ocean and receive ordination from a prelate of the established church. Many were thus withheld, who, had the colonies been furnished with bishops, would have taken orders. Nearly all, accordingly, who exercised the

the church has rapidly advanced in numbers and influence, and having Colleges, Theological Schools, Bible and Tract Societies, and domestic and foreign Missions, is as active and energetic in the diffusion of itself, as churches of other denominations.

Of the notices in this volume twenty-four are of bishops, of whom four were of this diocess, and three of them for a time contemporaneously; Bishop Provoost and his assistant, Bishop Moore, surviving several years the appointment of Bishop Hobart as a second assistant. Of those in humbler stations, whose history, from their talents, character, and success, is peculiarly attractive, Maryland has had a distinguished share. The denomination has cause to congratulate itself that the commemoration of the long line of laborious and useful ministers by whom it has been served, has been undertaken by one so eminently qualified as Dr. Sprague, by industry, candor, and skill. This memorial of their labors and virtues, more tasteful and honorable than the most gorgeous monument art can rear, should be possessed and prized by every friend of the church.

Art. VII.—A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters XLIV. and XLV.

XLIV. The preceding chapter closed with a prediction that God would give up Israel to chastening and reproach because of the apostasy of the rulers and priests. He now, however, addresses them as still his chosen people, and promises, at length, to pour out his Spirit on them, and bring them to acknowledge him as their covenant God, vs. 1–5. He proclaims himself their King and Redeemer, and reminds them of the proofs he has given in the revelations he made of the future that he alone is God, vs. 6–9. The makers and worshippers of images are without understanding. They have not intelligence and consideration enough to discover the senselessness of worshipping an idol, made by their own hands from a tree, planted and reared by themselves, and part of which they use for fuel to warm them-

selves, and part to cook their food, vs. 9–17. They have no comprehension of their own acts. They are blinded, they are given over to the dominion of lies, vs. 18–20. God, however, will not abandon Israel. He will redeem him from the dominion and the curse of his sins, vs. 21–22. The heavens and earth are summoned to chant their redemption as already accomplished; for God, who made and upholds the heavens and earth, will confute the impostors who professed to speak in the name of idol deities, and will confirm the word of his prophets; calling Cyrus into life, who he had foreshown should restore his people from Babylon; and speaking Jerusalem back from its ruins, as he had promised it should be rebuilt, vs. 23–28.

1, 2. Apostrophes.—"And now hear, Jacob, my servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen; thus saith Jehovah, thy maker and former from the womb will help thee. Fear not, my servant Jacob, and Jeshurun, whom I have chosen," vs. 1, 2. God addresses them as his servants and his chosen people still, though driven for ages into exile because of

midst of the grass, like willows by the water-courses. This shall say, I (am) to Jehovah, and this shall call [himself] by the name of Jacob; and this shall inscribe with his hand, to Jehovah, and with the name of Israel shall name (himself), vs. 4, 5. They, of the generation that comes into existence under those new-creating influences of the Spirit, are to spring into a fresh and vigorous life, like plants by running streams that are always supplied with water; and are instantly to recognise and acknowledge their relations to Jehovah and his people as the most sacred, the most honorable, and the most momentous that they sustain. The fancy indulged by many commentators that the Gentiles, not Israelites, are the subjects of this prophecy, and that the event denoted by the avowal of their relation to God and assumption of these names, is their accession to the church, is not only without any ground, and irreconcilable with the terms of the prediction, but is precluded by the comparisons: as the subject of the verb, spring up, is the offspring of Israel; whence, as it is the law of the comparison that the things compared are those which the names by which they are designated literally denote—it is the offspring of Jacob, the seed of Jeshurun, who are to spring up like grass and willows under the outpouring of the Spirit, and avow themselves as consecrated to Jehovah, and name themselves as the descendants of Israel.

Jehovah now asserts his title to be believed in the utterance of this promise, as alone having a foresight of the future. None of the false gods, whose prophets proclaimed the perpetual triumph of Israel's enemies, had any knowledge of futurity.

7. Apostrophe to Israel.—"Thus saith Jehovah, King of Israel, and his redeemer Jehovah of hosts, I (am) first, and I last, and beside me there is no God. And who like me could call [a people like Israel], and tell it [beforehand of its renovation], and state it to me, since I constituted the ancient people [mine], and things then coming and that are [yet] to come can tell to them [for their instruction]," vs. 6, 7. The acts meant of calling and foretelling, are the acts of calling a nation like Israel into existence and into the relations of a chosen people, and foretelling the great events of their agency and his providence towards them in chasten-

ing and redeeming them. Jehovah is adequate to this, because he is the first and the last, the creator and upholder of all; and thence all is embraced in his knowledge, and subject to his control. But who else stands in such a relation to any of the nations of the earth? Who else is self-existent, almighty, all-knowing, and the creator and upholder of human beings? The supposition of other similar beings is not only proofless but absurd. But Jehovah, possessing those attributes and exercising those acts, is entitled to the perfect confidence of his people.

8. Apostrophe to Israel.—"Tremble not, and be not afraid. Have I not from that time told thee and declared [the future]? And are ye not my witnesses? Is there a God besides me? There is no rock. I know not any," vs. 8. The time from which he had foretold to the Israelites the great purposes of mercy he had formed towards them, was the time of the original call of Abraham and promise of a blessing on his seed. Through the whole period that had intervened to the date of this prophecy—more than a

"The formers of the graven image, all of them are vanity; and their delights [their idols] are worthless; and their witnesses themselves will not see, and do not know, that they may be ashamed," vs. 9. The delights of the image carvers are the idols they form. Their witnesses are the worshippers of the idols, who know from experience that their gods have no foreknowledge nor power. They are called witnesses, therefore, of their nothingness, as the people of Jehovah, who have in their experience vast proofs of his prescience and truth, are called his witnesses. But the votaries of idols are so blind and besotted that they do not see that their imagined gods are but forms of senseless matter, that owe their shape, in which alone they present a resemblance to intelligent beings, to their hands. And he points out their utter want of discernment, and the sottishness with which they disregard their own relations as makers to their idols.

"Who formed the god, and cast the image that is of no use? Lo, all his fellows shall be ashamed. And the workmen themselves are of men: They shall assemble all of them; they shall stand; they shall tremble; they shall be ashamed together," vs. 10, 11. He proposes to prove the senselessness of image worshippers from the origin of their images. Who is it that projects and procures the casting or sculpture of a god? By his fellows, is meant his associates; the artists whom he employs in the work. Whoever they are, of whatever name or rank, they, it is predicted, shall be ashamed. However undiscerning, however proud of their skill, however infatuated with the idea that the shapes they fabricate are divine, the time shall come when they will be ashamed; for instead of being of a higher order of intelligences than the individual who employs them to frame the image, who might seem to give it a nature in some relation as lofty as their own, they are themselves but human beings; they are but ordinary men; and the hour will arrive when the true character of their work will be disclosed to them. They shall stand at God's tribunal; they shall tremble at the discovery of their senselessness and presumption in affecting to make deities of wood and stone, and feel it to be disgraceful to themselves as rational beings, as well as impious towards the self-existent Jehovah,

who alone is God. He now describes the work of the smith who formed the tools by which an image was made, and the process of the worker in wood who used them in carving the figure.

"The worker in iron (makes) an axe (or cutting instrument). He has wrought it in the coals, and with the hammer he will shape it, and then work at it with his strong arm. Moreover he is hungry, and has no strength; he has not drunk water and is faint," vs. 12. This seems the most probable sense of this passage: The worker in iron, who forms an axe or cutting instrument, by which the worker in wood is to cut down the tree from which the image is to be carved, is one of the fellows of the maker of the god, who are to be ashamed. And in forming the axe or cutting instrument, he proceeds on the assumption that the god that is to be shaped by the tool he fabricates is to be framed by human hands, and from wood, or some other substance, that is, in

such wonders. His strength fails; he faints from weariness and thirst. How could this be, if the worker in wood, for whom he is toiling and who is no stronger than himself, were able to give omnipotence to the image which he shapes?

The carver who uses the tool made by the smith, is equally senseless in his procedure.

10, 11. Comparisons: "The worker in wood has stretched a line; he will mark it with the awl; he will form it with the chisels, and with the compass will he mark it, and then make it like the structure of a man, like the beauty of mankind, to dwell in a house," vs. 13. The worker in wood also proceeds in the knowledge, that the material of which he proposes to frame a god is dead matter, that, like all other wood, is under his power, and may be wrought into any shape and appropriated to any purpose that he chooses. He assumes, therefore, that if it is constituted by him a deity it will be by the use of the tools with which he shapes it: not by an omnipotent act of will, endowing it with life and intelligence, and investing it with authority over men. He assumes, moreover, that the dimensions of his deity are to be determined by the measuring line and compass, or the size and figure of the human body; and that its divinity, therefore, is to be altogether material. As all that he aims to do, and does, is to determine its shape; to mould it into a human form, neither having capacity nor a purpose to impart to it any mental attributes, it is plain that it is still to be when finished—as unintelligent, as senseless, and as powerless as it was before. The supposition, moreover, that it becomes a deity by the shape it receives, implies that it approximates gradually towards a divinity as its form is wrought out; and that the feature or limb, an eye, an ear, a head, a foot, that is first finished, becomes divine while its other parts continue mere dead matter, which is absurd. Besides, if it is constituted a god by its mere shape, how much more must the artist and the owner, after whose figure it is modelled, and who, beside their human shape, have intelligence, sensibility, will, and power of acting on objects around them, be gods, and of an immeasurably higher rank? How senseless and contradictious, therefore, to ascribe to the mere image a grade of attributes loftier than their own, and assume towards it the attitude of inferiors and dependents?

The carver exhibits the same fatuity in selecting the tree from which he is to frame the image.

"He is about to hew him down cedars; and he has taken a cypress and an oak; and has strengthened it for himself among the trees of the forest; he has planted a pine, and the rain shall increase its size," vs. 14. Here also he proceeds on the fact, that there is nothing in the nature of the material from which the god is to be formed, that can make it divine. It is at the artist's option to select the cedar, the oak, the cypress, the pine, or any other tree of the forest. He takes a tree already grown, if he pleases, or plants one and waits till the rain and sun have nourished it to due size and solidity; indicating, that instead of any inherent divinity it is to owe its becoming a god to him; and that in place of possessing any sway or authority over him, it is altogether helpless, and subject to his will.

"And it (the tree) shall be for man to burn; and he has taken of it and warmed himself: yes, he kindles and bakes bread; yes, he will form a god and fall prostrate; he has

affections, the result of which is, that they fail of discerning and feeling their senselessness and folly. "They have not known, and they do not understand, for he has smeared their eyes from seeing, and their hearts from wisely considering," vs. 18. They are as undiscerning of the true nature of the facts on which they proceed, as they would be of the material objects with which they deal in their acts, if their eyes were so smeared with pitch as to preclude their seeing them. They are as devoid of the emotions and sentiments which those facts should awaken, as they could be, if all susceptibility of shame and self-reproach were struck from their hearts.

13. Metaphor in the use of turn to heart, to signify contemplating, so as to discern and feel the true nature of his acts. "And he will not turn it to heart; and there is not knowledge, and understanding to say, Half of it I have burned in the fire, and have also baked bread on its coals; I have roasted flesh and eat; and the rest of it shall I make to be an abomination; to the stock of a tree shall I cast myself down?" vs. 19. The slightest intelligent consideration, the faintest gleam of understanding would lead him to see that in burning one half and using the coals to roast flesh and bake bread, he had treated it as mere senseless matter like other wood used for fuel; and that that part, therefore, of precisely the same nature of which he had made the graven image, could not possess any attribute of divinity, nor have any title to homage.

14, 15, 16. Hypocatastases. "He feeds on ashes; (his) heart is deceived, it has led him astray, and he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?" vs. 20. Feeding on ashes, which none but a delirious person could do, and which could only prove fatal, is put for relying for the nourishment and life of the soul on a false worship, which must prove fatal to that. Leading him astray from the path he should pursue, is put for prompting him to a religious trust and service by which he forfeits the blessings he seeks, instead of securing them. Having a lie in the hand, is put for a false worship on which the idolater builds his hope of blessings from his god.

His self-delusion, his infatuation becomes so absolute, that he is unable to see, what the instincts of his nature should

disclose to him, that the means to which he is resorting for life, are the most direct and infallible means of death.

God now turns to his own people, and enjoins them to consider these proofs of the ignorance and sottishness of the makers and worshippers of idols.

17. Apostrophe. "Remember these things, Jacob and Israel; for thou art my servant: I have formed thee; a servant to me, thou art," vs. 21.

That they were the chosen people of Jehovah, that he had formed them, that he had revealed himself to them; that he had entered into covenant with them, that he had communicated to them his will, and that he had watched over them, delivered them and defended them through a long series of ages, and given them the most resplendent and resistless proofs of his being, power, knowledge, and goodness, should have led them to discern and feel the folly and madness of the worship of idols. Not to see and realize it, would bespeak a greater measure of fatuity, and perverseness than the adorers of images displayed, who stood

he—able and purposing to bestow these infinite gifts,—presented to the carved gods of the Gentiles, who had neither power nor wisdom to save; who had neither intelligence nor life!

He now summons the heavens and earth, the mountains and forests, to sing the forgiveness and redemption of Israel as already accomplished.

23, 24, 25. Personifications. "Sing, oh heaven, for Jehovah hath done it. Shout, ye lower parts of the earth. Break forth, ye mountains, into song, the forest, and every tree in it: for Jehovah hath redeemed Jacob, and he will glorify himself in Israel," vs. 23. The whole realm of nature, heaven through all its heights, earth in its lowest depths, mountains and forests, are summoned to recognise and proclaim Jehovah, not idols, as the redeemer of Israel, and to chant their redemption as displaying his glory in its brightest resplendence. In what other mode could the prediction have been presented that would have invested the event with such an air of a reality that was perceived and felt by the senses! And in what truth and beauty it exhibits the relation of the earth and its products to him, as dependents whose office it is to chant him as the redeemer of his people, not, as idolaters imagine, to yield materials for the fabrication of image-gods that can neither save nor hear!

Jehovah now proclaims himself to Israel as creating and upholding the material universe; and as baffling and confounding the prognostics and predictions of those who professed to be the messengers of false gods; but as verifying the word of his own prophets, and as predicting that Jerusalem should again be inhabited, and the wasted cities of Judah rebuilt, and foreshowing that Cyrus should be the instrument by which those events should be accomplished.

26. Hypocatastasis, in the use of turns back for baffling. "Thus saith Jehovah thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb; I am Jehovah that makes all; that stretches out the heavens alone; that spreads out the earth by myself; that frustrates the signs of babblers, and makes diviners mad; that turns sages back, and infatuates their knowledge; that confirms the word of his servant, and fulfils the counsel of his messengers; who says as to Jerusalem, she shall be inhabited; and as to the cities of Judah, they shall be built, and her ruins I will raise: that says

to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy streams; that says to Cyrus, He is my Shepherd, and he shall fulfil all my pleasure; saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thou shalt be founded," vs. 24–28. This great prediction was to furnish his people with a fresh test of his truth. Its verification would demonstrate his prescience of all things, his absolute dominion over men, his power to accomplish his will, the nothingness of idols and the falsehood of their prophets; and show him in the most wondrous and glorious forms to be indeed the God and Redeemer of his chosen people. What a vast series of acts; what a countless multitude of events were to be conditions of its accomplishment—the continuance of the earth through the two centuries ere it was to be fully verified; the calling into life and support of the generations of mankind during that period; the creation of Cyrus, his elevation to power, his conquest of Babylon, and the direction of all the long train of causes and effects that led to the restoration of the Israelites from Babylon; and the decrée for the rebuild-

mises that have been made to him, vs. 17–19. All nations are summoned to receive this prophecy as a test of the omniscience, supreme power, and faithfulness of God to his people, and are forewarned that it is his purpose to bring all nations and individuals to acknowledge him as Jehovah and the Redeemer of Israel, vs. 20–25.

1, 2, 3. Hypocatastases. "Thus saith Jehovah to his anointed, to Cyrus whose right hand I have held fast, to tread down before him nations, and the loins of kings I will loose; to open before him double doors, and the gates shall not be shut," vs. 1. Cyrus is called God's anointed, simply to denote that he was set apart as a monarch to the work of judgment on the idolatrous nations and of deliverance to Israel that is here foreshown of him. His being held by Jehovah by the right hand, is put by substitution for God's upholding and directing him as the agent of his purposes. Treading down nations before him is put for divesting them of power to resist him, and reducing them to submission to his sway. Loosing the loins of kings, by removing the girdles with which their robes were bound, and thereby unfitting them for the free motion that was requisite for the defence of themselves in battle, is put for an analogous disarray of their minds by inebriation perhaps, confusion, or terror, by which they would be unfitted to repel their assailants. The predictions, to open before him double or two-leaved doors, and that gates should not be shut, might be taken as used by the same figure, were it not that they had a literal fulfilment at the conquest of Babylon,—the doors at the head of the stairways leading from the river into the city, being left open, and the gates also of the palace, so that the troops of Cyrus entered them without obstruction.

4, 5, 6, 7. Hypocatastases. "I will go before thee: and uneven places I will level; doors of brass I will break, and bars of iron I will cut," vs. 2. Going before him is put for acting as his guide, or counsellor; levelling uneven places, for removing obstructions to his easy and rapid progress towards the capitals he was to conquer; and breaking the brazen doors and cutting the iron bars, of their walls and palaces, for giving him an unobstructed entrance into them. Those predictions of an easy triumph over the greatest obstacles, of unobstructed *success* against all his enemies, had a

conspicuous verification in the wars of Cyrus with the Lydians, the Babylonians, and other nations. In the capture of Babylon, especially, they were signally fulfilled in the diversion of the river from its channel, by which a passage was opened into the city on a line that was before impassable; and in the neglect of the guards to close the gates at the head of the stairways from the river, and the doors of the palace, by which the Persian soldiers were enabled to enter the city and palace without hindrance.

"And I will give thee, the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, in order that thou mayest know that I Jehovah [the self-existent] who call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel," vs. 3. The treasures of darkness and hidden riches of secret places, were the treasures laid up by the monarchs he was to conquer, in the recesses of their palaces. This prediction had a striking fulfilment in the conquest of Crœsus, king of Lydia, as well as in the sack of Babylon: the sum surrendered by that prince to Cyrus, having equalled, it is said, five or six hundred

people. It was not at all for the gratification or glory of the Persian conqueror, who was but his instrument. The purpose was formed and revealed long before Cyrus came into life: it was in a large measure accomplished before he became aware of the prophecy, or even heard the name of Jehovah.

It was the purpose of God, also, that through this prophecy and its fulfilment by Cyrus, all the nations of the empire east and west, should be brought to know that he the self-existent alone is God.

8. Hypocatastasis. "I am Jehovah (the self-existent), and there is no other: Except me there is no God; I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me; that they may know from the rising of the sun and from the west, that there is none beside me," vs. 5, 6. Girding him, which was to adjust his robe so as to allow him free action in battle, is put for endowing him with such mental gifts as to qualify him for the important agency to which he was to be called. They of the east from Palestine, were the inhabitants of Assyria, Babylonia, and Persia; they of the west, the nations of Asia-Minor whom Cyrus conquered. The whole population who were to become subject to Cyrus, were to be led by this prophecy and its fulfilment in the extraordinary career of that conqueror, to the knowledge of Jehovah as the God of Israel; and the only God having a foresight of the future, and the disposal of its events. This knowledge was conveyed to them by the decree of Cyrus, addressed to his subjects. Ezra i. 1–3. He made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and also in writing, saying: "Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia; Jehovah God of heaven hath given me all kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is then among you of all his people? His God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem which is in Judah and build the house of Jehovah God of Israel, (He the God) which is in Jerusalem." Here is thus an express recognition of Jehovah as the self-existent, the God of heaven, and the God of Israel, as the giver to Cyrus of his power and dominion, and as charging him to build him a temple at Jerusalem. All his subjects were thus made acquainted with the name, the perfections, and these acts of Jehovah, and doubtless through the Jews, who were everywhere dispersed, west as well as east, they were apprised more fully of the rela-

tions of Jehovah to his people, this prediction of their restoration by the agency of Cyrus, and the demonstration it formed that Jehovah is alone God.

God accordingly proclaims himself the only God, the creator and the ruler of all.

"I am Jehovah, and there is no other; forming the light and creating darkness, making peace and creating evil. I (am) Jehovah doing all these things," vs. 6, 7. He was not only to call Cyrus into existence, enable him to conquer a vast empire, and make him the instrument of delivering the Israelites from their captivity to the Babylonians; but he is the author of all things, light and darkness, the blessings of peace and the calamities of war. He is the maker and determiner of all. There is no other creator, there is no other being that is not his creature; there are no good gifts, there are no physical or political evils that are not of his ordering; and this is demonstrated by this prophecy and its fulfilment respecting Cyrus, the nations he was to conquer, and the people of God he was to deliver. None but a self-existent being, on whom all other existences

as the heavens sending down drops, and pouring down showers; and the earth's opening, and bringing forth plants, and causing them to spring up. But that which the one is to pour down, and the other to send up from its bosom, are the characteristic acts of holy beings, to which the sky and the ground are incompetent; and the use of the apostrophes is, that the prophet might show that if the sky and earth were supposed to give birth to such supernatural effects, or exert influences that should generate them in men, Jehovah would still be their real author. They would be but fresh proofs of his being, his self-existence, his authorship of all, and his universal dominion.

They are now rebuked who were to be dissatisfied that God selected such a person as Cyrus to be the instrument of delivering his people.

11. Hypocatastasis. "Woe unto him that strives with his Maker. [Let] the potsherd [strive] with the potsherds of the earth. Shall clay say to him that fashions it, What makest thou? Or thy work [to thee], He has no hands?" vs. 9. The expression, he has no hands, is put for he has no taste, no skill. This implies that some of the Israelites to be delivered from captivity at Babylon, by the hands of Cyrus, or perhaps others, who simply contemplate it as foreshown in this prophecy, would regard it with surprise and disapprobation, and would reproach and denounce it as though it was unsuitable to the relations of the chosen people to Jehovah. But such a contest with him, the Maker and disposer of all, would bespeak the most impious presumption. If a fragment of a broken earthen vessel were to strive, it should strive not with the Almighty, but with worthless sherds like itself. It does not belong to the clay, of which a vessel is to be formed, to determine what shape shall be given to it, or for what use it shall be fitted. It has no inherent rights. It is the prerogative of the potter, to whom it is to owe its new form and adaptation to use by human beings, to decide what its size, figure, and adaptation for a particular service shall be. It does not belong to the material, of which a work of art is formed, to impeach the judgment and skill of the artist who forms it, and say, He has no hands. And it was equal presumption and arrogance in the Israelites to reproach God for selecting the monarch of Persia to be the agent of delivering them from

their bondage at Babylon, and rebuilding their temple. They had no right to demand a deliverance and decide who should be the instrument of its accomplishment. They were offenders against God; they had forfeited all title to his favor. Their country was conquered and wasted, their cities sacked and burned, their temple destroyed, and they or their fathers carried into captivity, because of their transgressions. Their restoration accordingly was to be of grace, not of right; and its time, its mode, and the agent through whom it was to be accomplished, it was God's prerogative to appoint, as his wisdom pleased.

"Woe unto him that saith unto his father, What begettest thou? and to a woman, What wilt thou bring forth?" vs. 10. Such reproachful questions would be senseless, as well as insolent; as the off-spring of the father and the mother would, necessarily, be such as accorded with their nature, and as their constitutions were formed to produce. And so also, the appointments of God in respect to the redemption of Israel were such as accorded with his attributes and sta-

instrumentality of a pagan prince, on the ground that it would be regarded by the votaries of the gods whom the Persians worshipped, as the work of their deities, not of Jehovah. It was imagined that to refute their boast at the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, that the Babylonian deities had triumphed over Jehovah the God of Israel, and shown themselves to be superior to him, by seizing the vessels of the temple as their trophies, and carrying his worshippers captive to Babylon, he should have delivered them by his own hand, or through the agency of one of his own people, and in that manner made the restoration of the nation and the vessels of the temple, an open triumph over the false gods to whom the Babylonians and Persians paid their homage. But God proceeds to show that his vindication was most effectually accomplished by the method he had chosen.

12. Hypocatastasis. "I raised him (Cyrus) up in righteousness, and all his ways I will make straight. He shall build my city, and my captives he shall send home, not for reward, and not for hire, saith Jehovah of Hosts," vs. 13. God chose Cyrus for his instrument for the very purpose of vindicating himself from aspersion, and showing his people and the nations that he alone, the self-existent, is God. And this he effects by bringing that prince to a distinct and public acknowledgment of him as Jehovah the God of heaven, and the God of Israel, and to restore his people and rebuild the city and temple in obedience to his command. Ezra i. 1–4. In place of doing it as the agent of idol gods, he was to do it as the minister, the anointed instrument of Jehovah, and was to proclaim it to all the nations of his empire, that he acted in it, in that office. And this service he was to render, not from sordid motives, not for any reward in the form of territory or treasure, but as a pure act of obedience, from the conviction produced by this prophecy—which was to be communicated to him—that Jehovah is indeed self-existent, all-knowing, all-controlling, and the God of Israel. Under the impulse of that persuasion, he relinquished subjects instead of gaining them; he gave up large treasures in place of receiving them as a ransom of the captives whom he set at liberty. God proceeds to foreshow accordingly, that the effect of the mode of liberation he had chosen should be, first, the recognition

by the nations of Jehovah as the self-existent, and the God of Israel; then of the nothingness of idols; and finally, of the vindication of himself as the Redeemer of his people, and wise and holy and faithful in all his ways.

"Thus saith Jehovah, the labor of Egypt, and merchandise of Ethiopia, and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over to thee, and shall be thine; after thee shall they come; in chains shall they pass over, and shall bow themselves unto thee; to thee shall they pray—(saying) Only in thee is God, and there is none beside, no God. Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God the Saviour," vs. 14, 15. The effect of their redemption in the manner God proposed, was thus to be to bring the nations at a distance from Babylon and Persia, namely Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba, or Meroe, to a distinct recognition of Jehovah as the only God; and an admission that the mode in which he proceeded with his people and the idolatrous nations sprang from motives wholly unlike what they had imagined. They had, doubtless, at the victory of the Babylonians over Israel, re-

reign will, and thus cut off all ground for the pretext that their restoration was the work of the false deities by whose worshippers they had been held captive.

13, 14, 15. Metonymies, in the use of Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba, for the population of those countries.

And the salvation to be conferred on Israel is not to be a temporary one, but is to continue through eternity. It is a salvation, therefore, which Jehovah, the self-existent, alone can bestow. "Israel shall be saved in Jehovah with an everlasting salvation. Ye shall not be ashamed, ye shall not be confounded to the ages of eternity," vs. 17. Their trust in Jehovah will always prove to be well founded. He will never desert them: He will confer on them a salvation that is to be everlasting. They will never, through the ages of eternity, blush for their faith in him. This implies that they are to continue as a nation through the ages of eternity, and that whatever apostasies they may fall into before their final recovery, they will at length be recalled to their allegiance, and be through a ceaseless succession of generations his obedient people. And in this everlasting redemption of them he will but act in accordance with his attributes and station as the Almighty Creator and righteous ruler of the universe.

"For thus saith Jehovah, the creator of the heavens; he is God who formed the earth and made it; he established it; not in vain did he create it: he formed it to be inhabited; I am Jehovah (the Self-existent), and there is none beside," vs. 18. Being self-existent, and the creator of the heavens and earth, with all that belongs to them, there cannot be a rival Deity, there cannot be another God that can thwart him in his purposes. All other existences are his creatures and dependents. He can use them as the instruments of his will, or strike them at any moment out of life as he pleases; and as he called the earth into existence, and gave it a place in the group of worlds to which it belongs, he called it into being for an end that is commensurate with the perpetuity it is itself to possess; and that end is, that it may be the residence of mankind, according to the covenant with Noah for "perpetual generations." It was in harmony with this great design, therefore, that he had promised Palestine to Israel, as a perpetual possession, and that he was purposing to return them from their captivity at Babylon, and re-establish them in it as their inheritance.

"I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth. I said not unto the seed of Jacob: Seek ye my face in vain. I, Jehovah, speak truth; I declare things that are right," vs. 19. His promise of Canaan to Israel was a public and a sincere one. It was not made in secret that it could be annulled; nor was its fulfilment to be prevented by their apostasy for a period to idols. Whenever they should again seek him, it would not be in vain. A return to him in repentance, submission, and love, would be followed by the restoration to them of his mercy and the fulfilment of all his great and gracious promises.

God now addresses the Gentiles, and demands of them who it is who has foreshown the great events that are here foretold.

16. Apostrophe. "Gather yourselves and come; draw near together, ye escaped of the nations; they know not who carry the wood of their graven images, and pray to a god that cannot save," vs. 20. That those here addressed are to be the escaped of the nations, implies that they are to be of

Jehovah now summons all the inhabitants of the earth to look unto him for salvation, and announces the gracious purpose to bring them all at length to submission to his sceptre.

17. Apostrophe. "Turn unto me, all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved; for I am God, and there is none beside," vs. 22.

18. Hypocatastasis in the substitution of turning to God, for conversion, or obedience to him.

19. Metonymy: of the ends of the earth, for those inhabiting them. This is to be regarded as a prediction of the command to all nations to turn unto Jehovah for salvation, which is to be addressed to them at the time when these promises respecting the redemption of Israel shall be fully accomplished at Christ's second coming; rather than a command addressed to them when the prophecy was communicated to the prophet. It is when the prophecy respecting the final and everlasting salvation of Israel is accomplished, and the whole course of God's dealings with them shall be reviewed, demonstrating in the clearest manner that there is no God besides Jehovah; that they are to be summoned, as foreshown in this apostrophe, to turn to Jehovah for salvation. And he now announces the design to bring them all to the recognition and homage of him.

20. Hypocatastasis. "By myself I have sworn; the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return; that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." The not returning of the word, that had gone out of his mouth, is put by substitution for its not failing of its effect; it is to meet an absolute accomplishment. The time of this universal recognition of him as Jehovah by men, and submission to his authority, is to be the time of Christ's second coming, when he is to receive the dominion of the earth, that all people, nations, and languages may serve him. Dan. vii. 13, 14; Rev. xi. 15.

21. Hypocatastasis. "Only in Jehovah, he shall say, have I righteousness and strength. Unto him shall he come, and all that were incensed at him (Jehovah) shall be ashamed," vs. 24. Coming to Jehovah for salvation is put for submitting to him, and accepting his grace.

Having Jehovah as the source of righteousness and strength, is, in the language of the New Testament, to rest on Christ by faith for justification by his obedience and blood. Those

who are then to be ashamed, are the incorrigible enemies, who had hated and despised him.

The Israelites also are to be saved in the same manner by the merits of Christ. "In Jehovah (also) shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory," vs. 25.

Though standing in such sacred relations to him, and distinguished by gifts far above the Gentiles, they will be saved by the same divine righteousness, by the same sovereign and infinite mercy, as the nations that had before been addicted to the worship of idols.

The prophecy thus foreshows that the great controversy between Jehovah and the votaries of false deities which has been carried on for so many ages, is to issue in the utter confutation of the makers and worshippers of idols; the demonstration that Jehovah alone is God; and the vindication of all his ways towards his chosen people in abandoning them for a time to the power of idol worshippers, and in delivering them in the sovereign and extraordinary ways he has chosen. The whole is at length at Christ's second

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME XII. OCTOBER, 1859. NUMBER II.

ART. I.—REV. MR. LEE'S ESCHATOLOGY.

ESCHATOLOGY; OR, THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE COMING OF THE LORD, THE JUDGMENT, AND THE RESURRECTION. By Samuel Lee. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1859.

THE views advanced by Mr. Lee on Christ's Second Coming, the Resurrection, and the Judgment, are essentially those presented by Professor Bush some fifteen years ago in his Anastasis; namely, that Christ's coming, instead of a personal, is merely a providential or spiritual one, and occurs to individuals at their death; that the resurrection, in place of a reviviscence of the body, is but the continued subsistence of the soul in a new form which it assumes at death: and that the final judgment of individuals takes place also as they pass from the present life into the state of being that follows it. The work, however, exhibits very little of the philological learning, the force of argument, or the grace of diction that mark Professor Bush's volume. Its merits in the sphere of exposition and reasoning are very slight. Professor Bush, with all his advantages of versatile genius and large culture, wholly failed, in our judgment, to establish the views for which he argued. It was an attempt

to give a color of truth to doctrines that are in direct antagonism with the plain and indubitable teachings of the sacred word; and was the offspring, in a measure, of his theory, drawn from Swedenborg, that the prophetic meaning of the Scriptures lies in an allegorical or spiritual, instead of their grammatical sense. Mr. Lee has scarcely succeeded in any instance in giving an air of probability to his views either by the speciousness or the force of his logic. The spaces betwixt his premises and conclusions, which should have been filled by proofs, are generally either left vacant or only occupied by assumptions and expressions of opinion. We do not propose to notice at length the several topics he discusses, but only to glance at the chief, and point out the errors into which he falls and the results to which they lead.

I. He alleges that the genuine sense of Christ's teachings is that in which the apostles understood them at the time they were delivered to them. That, therefore, whatever his language is, we must regard him as declaring to us—not what it absolutely means, but simply what the apostles—

that Christ did not teach that he is to reign here in person as he now reigns in heaven. If their impressions and expectations in regard to his kingdom are a true index of the purposes he announced to them, as they held that he was to reign here in person, what can be more certain than that he taught them that he is?

But this new doctrine of interpretation is as false in principle as it is fatal to the theory Mr. Lee employs it to sustain. He founds it on the assumption that Christ meant to convey to his disciples exactly the conceptions of his kingdom which they drew from his discourses, on the pretext that if he did not, he intentionally deceived them.

"If, when the Saviour spoke of coming in his glory and rewarding them for their fidelity, he had reference only to the future world [a future age he should have said, to meet the point he proposes to prove] while yet they understood him to refer to what was temporal [immediate, during their lives], did he not of purpose deceive them? Did he not again and again, amid the discouragements connected with discipleship to him in his state of humility, hold out to them encouragements which, as understood by them, and known of course to him as so understood, had no foundation in fact? What I know a man understands by what I say to him, that I do say to him."—P. 4.

Were the principle for which he here contends admitted, it would subvert his theory, not sustain it. For he concedes that—

"The language of the prophets was in the time of Christ understood to imply that there was to be raised up a mighty prince who should rule over the Jews in power and splendor, and should lead them on, not only to the attainment of their liberty from the yoke of oppression, but to the conquest of the nations. And it was to posts of honor in such a kingdom and under such a prince that the disciples aspired."—P. 9.

If, then, they were confirmed in those impressions by Christ's teachings, and they were thence the identical views he meant to convey to them, it is a proof that he taught them that he is to reign in person over the Israelites, deliver them from their oppressors, and bring all other nations

to subjection to his sceptre: and thence it disproves Mr. Lee's doctrine that no such personal reign of the Redeemer on earth is taught in the Scriptures.

But his assumption is wholly mistaken, that Christ is to be considered as sustaining all the constructions the disciples, during his ministry, placed on his teachings that were at the time left by him uncorrected. The fact that he knew what the views were which they formed of his doctrines, no more placed him under obligation then to correct their errors, than his knowledge of the errors of the Scribes and Pharisees obliged him to correct the false notions of him and his teachings which they entertained.

How could it? He did not sanction the inculcation by them on others of any of their erroneous views. On his commissioning them at his ascension to preach, he imparted to them the Holy Spirit, by which all their mistaken thoughts and false judgments were swept from their minds, and the truth on all subjects on which they were to teach, communicated to them in its fulness and consistency. Why

no other clue to his meaning than that which is furnished by the established usages of the terms in which he expressed it. Above all, he did not constitute the views uninspired men may have formed of his doctrines, the index and test of his meaning. The impressions and conceptions of his disciples *while uninspired*, can no more be taken as an index of the doctrines he taught, than the conceptions and impressions of the uninspired hearers of the apostles of what they taught under the promptings of the Holy Spirit, can be taken as an index to their doctrines. Mr. L.'s rule of interpretation, if carried to its natural results, would, in effect, set aside the word of God, and substitute the mere opinions of uninspired men in its place.

It is no favorable omen that he opens his volume with the enunciation of so portentous a rule. What, however, is the use which he makes of it? What office does it fill in his general system of construction? The principal purpose for which he employs it, seems to be, to make out that a large share of the parabolic instructions given by Christ, respecting his kingdom, must have related to the dispensation that was then on the point of closing, instead of the dispensation of the gospel which he was about to institute in its place.

II. He next alleges that the title "The Son of Man" denotes the Messiah simply "as engaged *in introducing* his kingdom to the world, rather than in presiding in it;" and that "The Coming of the Son of Man" is applied simply to "the work of the Messiah from the time of his resurrection, to the overthrow of the Jewish power." Pp. 11–13. His object in this is to set aside, or turn to the support of his theory, all those prophecies in which it is foreshown that the Son of Man is, at a time still future, to come in the clouds of heaven in power and glory, and establish his throne on the earth. But his attempted limitation of that title of the Messiah, and of the period in which it is predicted he was and is to come as such, is wholly arbitrary and against the clearest teachings of Christ himself and the prophets. Mr. Lee alleges no proof of his assumption. All that he offers to sustain it is the mere fact that the title is in some passages applied to Christ while occupied in his work at his first advent. But that is no demonstration that

the events foreshown of him in other passages in which it is applied to him are not of a wholly different and a still future period. Mr. Lee might as well claim from the fact that Jehovah is the name by which God is designated in the history of the creation, Genesis ii. 4–9—that all the other passages in the Bible in which that name is used as his denominative, relate also and exclusively to the period of the creation.

How mistaken and arbitrary his assumption is, is seen from the first prophecy, Dan. vii. 9–14, which he alleges to support it. It is sufficient to cite that part of it which relates immediately to Christ.

"And I saw in the night visions, and behold one like a Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."—V. 13, 14.

appearing on the scene subsequently to the third, that it is the symbol of the rulers of a wholly different people. The Greek dynasties never assumed modifications corresponding to the ten horns with an eleventh that sprang up among them. Their empire was never broken into eleven contemporaneous kingdoms. On the other hand it is indubitable that the fourth beast is the symbol of the rulers of the Roman empire, from the fact that it corresponds exactly with the forms the government of that empire in the west assumed on its conquest by the Goths, and that it is symbolized also in the New Testament by another beast of ten horns as then existing, long after the Greek dynasties had come to an end, and as to continue to exist through a long series of ages. No proof can be more absolute therefore that it is the representative of the dynasties of the Roman empire, not of the Greek which the Roman superseded. It is consequently equally certain that the judgment and destruction of the fourth beast foreshown (vs. 9–12) are not representative of a destruction that took place, as Mr. Lee assumes, a long period anterior to Christ's first advent, but that is yet future, as is shown by the fact that the ten kingdoms of the western Roman empire, which the beast reigns over, are still in existence. And thence it is equally certain that the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds and reception of the earth as his empire, which his appearance in the vision foreshows, is not his first advent, but is one that is still future, and is that which is denominated his second coming, which is to take place at the close of the present dispensation. The passage thus, instead of sustaining, overthrows Mr. Lee's representation, that the coming of the Son of Man always denotes his coming at his first advent.

And this is confirmed by many other passages. Thus, John predicts in the Apocalypse, "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also who pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him," chap. i. 7. The coming here foreshown is unquestionably that predicted Dan. vii. 13, 14; and as it was uttered more than ninety years after his first advent, and more than sixty after his ascension to heaven, and was then still future, it cannot have had its accomplishment at

his birth at Bethlehem, nor during his ministry, nor in the period that elapsed between his ascension and the overthrow of Jerusalem. And that it has not yet been accomplished, but is still future, is equally certain from the fact that he has not yet come in the clouds of heaven visibly to every eye, nor have all the tribes of the earth wailed because of him.

Christ foretold also at his trial before the Sanhedrim, on the morning of his crucifixion, that "hereafter," that is at a time then *future*, "shall ye see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven," Matt. xxvi. 64; and in his prophecy (Matt. xxiv.) of the persecution of his followers, the destruction of Jerusalem, and his second advent, he reveals the time of that coming in the clouds as to follow the termination of the captivity into which the Jewish people were to be led at the overthrow of their capital by the Romans. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days"—defined in Luke xxi. 24, as the period of their captivity, during which Jerusalem was to be trodden down of the Gentiles—"shall the sun be darkened

glory, ages after his first advent. Another class he attempts to turn to his purpose by setting aside their grammatical sense, and assuming first, that the disciples must have understood them as relating exclusively to the period of his ministry, or a brief space that followed it, and then, according to his newly invented law of interpretation, that their construction of them must be taken as having Christ's sanction and indicating their true meaning. Of these is the parable of the tares, of which he says:

"What therefore they"—the disciples, "understood him to say, that he did say, and that is the meaning of his words to us.

"Putting ourselves then in the condition of the disciples, let us interpret, as they would, the parable.

"He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man. This defines *the time* as that in which the designation, 'Son of Man,' was applied to the Saviour. The disciples would think *only* of the then *present* time in which their master was inculcating the truths of the New Dispensation he was introducing to the world.

"The harvest is the end of the dispensation,—*this* dispensation." "The gathering of the wheat by a process that should eliminate the tares—the organization of a church of personally religious members—was not to take place till after the resurrection, when Christ should have retired from sight to the sphere of faith. He would then send forth his angels—that is, employ an appropriate agency *in organizing his church.*

"The tares are to be burned—cast into a furnace of fire. This refers to the fearful evils that were to come upon the unbelieving portion of *the Jewish nation.*

"In this parable the Saviour taught the disciples, that *the Jewish church* was hopeless of reformation. The attempt to gather the tares would root up the wheat also. It was no part of the errand of the Messiah to reform the Jewish church. It was to be destroyed, and a new one organized on a new principle, to succeed.

"Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father! This new church to be organized on the day of Pentecost, was to be a glorious church, and in its progressive sanctification and its earnest work of faith and labor of love, exhibit such a scene as earth had witnessed never."—Pp. 23–25.

All this, however, is against the clearest meaning of the parable. It is expressly presented by Christ as exemplifying the kingdom of heaven: that is the dispensation of the gospel which he in his ministry, and by the ministry of the apostles, introduced: and exemplifying it through its whole course to its end. For the harvest, when the tares are to be removed from the world, is to take place, he affirms, at the end of the age; that is the age or period of the kingdom, in the form which it bears in this dispensation. To limit the reference of the parable therefore to Christ's ministry, and the short period that followed to the overthrow of Jerusalem, and slaughter and captivity of the Jewish people, is unwarranted and arbitrary. It is to contradict the interpretation the Saviour himself gives of the parable, not to unfold it; and to put this false construction on it, under the pretext that it is the construction that was put on it by the disciples, is equally groundless and arbitrary. What evidence has Mr. Lee, that the disciples regarded the parable as referring exclusively to the Jews, and to the Jews of the

is to offer the grossest contradiction therefore to the known impressions and expectations of the disciples to assume that they must have regarded the parable as referring only to the age in which they lived, and to the believers and unbelievers of their nation.

But Mr. Lee misrepresents the whole aim itself of the parable, as palpably as he does the period it was designed to exemplify. He affirms that Christ's object in it was, to show that he "was to gather a pure and holy church, to be organized on the principle of personal holiness in the individual members, and to be composed in part of Jews." "This gathering of the wheat by a process that should eliminate the tares—the organization of a church of personally religious members—was not to take place till after *the resurrection*, when Christ should have retired from sight to the sphere of faith." In direct contravention of this, Christ interprets the parable as showing that the visible church, instead of consisting solely of persons that were holy, was to suffer an intermixture of a vast crowd of the unholy. "The good seed, are the children of the kingdom." The *kingdom* accordingly, in contradistinction from the nominal church, embraces only such. "The tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil." Their being sowed in the same field as the wheat, so that they spring up and grow together, implies, that the children of the wicked one are introduced among the children of the kingdom by a profession of Christian faith, and entrance thereby into the visible church. "The harvest is the end of the age; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this age. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels and they shall gather out of his kingdom all that cause stumbling, and those who do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire." The doctrine of the parable thus is, that the children of the devil are, during the present dispensation, to live intermixed in the visible church, with the children of God, and are not to be removed from among them till the dispensation closes at Christ's second coming:—the exact converse of the construction Mr. Lee puts on it, as representing "the organization" of a "pure and holy church, on the principle of personal holiness in the individual members!"

He cites several other passages to sustain his theory, but misrepresents them in the same arbitrary manner. It will be enough to refer to two.

He says of the prediction of the judgment of the living nations at Christ's second coming (Matt. xxv. 31–46); "The opening sentence, 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him,' is *figuratively* descriptive." But no assumption could be more groundless and absurd. What figure is there in it? There certainly is no comparison: there as certainly is no metaphor. The act of coming in glory with the holy angels, is suitable to Christ's nature and station; and is ascribed to him literally in several other passages. It was expressly declared by angels at his ascension in glory into a cloud in the sky; "This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i. 11.) And Christ had, just before uttering this prophecy of the judgment, foretold that his coming in glory is to be public and visible to all human eyes, and is to take

angels with him, and his being invested with the functions of Messiahship. If he comes in his office as Messiah, he must be invested with that office before he comes in it. An investiture with an office, and an exercise of the functions of that office, are wholly different acts, and take place in wholly different relations. In being invested with his office as king of the earth, Christ was the object of an act of which the Father was the agent. In coming in the clouds of heaven in his glory with all the holy angels with him, to judge the nations, he himself is the agent, and his act in coming in power and glory is an act of his office as the divine monarch of the earth. In like manner, in Daniel vii. 13, 14, his coming in the clouds of heaven, his investiture with the dominion of the earth, and his exercise of that dominion through endless years, are exhibited as distinct and different events. Mr. Lee's construction of the other expression is equally unjustifiable and preposterous. "Then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory," means, he says, "that he *will be* invested with supreme and absolute authority as head over all things." But that is to make his coming in his glory, and sitting on the throne of his glory, which are wholly different acts, representative of precisely the same event; and that an event of which he is the subject instead of the agent. But his sitting on his throne in possession of the power and prerogatives of Judge cannot be the representative of his being invested with authority to sit on it as Judge. It were to make a consequent the representative of its antecedent, the act of the Son the representative of the act of the Father of which the Son was the object. He regards the prediction, "and before him shall be gathered all nations," as equally "figurative;" and finally, on the one hand, denies that the prophecy refers to a future judgment; and on the other, affirms that it teaches a judgment after death. "The opening sentence, 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory,' does not refer to a future judgment, but to his investiture with the office of Messiahship. *The fact of a judgment after death*, and that it will be before Jesus Christ, is most solemnly and impressively taught."—P. 50. But after having denied the coming of the Judge, his session on his throne, the gathering of the nations before him, and the reference even of the prediction

to a judgment, how can he affirm that it emphatically teaches "the fact of a judgment before Christ after death?" How can a judgment in this world be the representative of a judgment in the next? How can a judgment of the *living* nations here be the representative of the judgment of individuals, instead of nations, after death? Can anything be clearer than that his assertion is wholly arbitrary and reasonless?

Such is the confusion and contradiction in which he involves himself in this attempt to wrench these predictions from their plain and indubitable meaning, that they may not stand in the way of his antiscriptural theory.

His next allegation is equally unfortunate. "The high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him; Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."—Matt. xxvi. 63–64. Of this he says,

pedients to which Mr. Lee resorts to sustain his theories, or the audacity with which he employs them. It is manifest that the most explicit and solemn declarations of Christ are no obstacles to his denying that he taught what he affirmed, and ascribing to his language a wholly foreign and unauthorised meaning.

III. He next treats of "The Coming of the Lord," "the Appearing of Jesus Christ," "the Revelation of Jesus Christ," and other equivalent expressions, affirming that they do not signify his personal coming, but instead, *denote the departure of persons from the earth by death.*

"What is the great group of facts referred to by the phrase, The Coming of the Lord? It has its definite primary import, also is used to suggest some incident or incidents of the primary fact.

"These facts in general are those of importance that are connected with *the death of the body.* And the phrase presents these facts as viewed from the stand-point of faith, and not as they appear from the stand-point of earth and sense. It represents the *important* elements that enter into the case; while those which are almost exclusively regarded by those without faith, and made too prominent by those of feeble faith, are not included.

"When the present mode of existence ends, another succeeds, in which in a method not known to us now, we shall have a power of perceiving spiritual beings, and especially of recognising Christ, that will be as impressive, as influential upon our practical convictions, as is now the sense of sight. The Saviour *will appear.* So of the angels and the spirits of just men made perfect. So of all the realities of the spiritual world.

"The Coming of the Lord, then, is not merely a periphrasis for death. It is rather significant of a great group of facts in the history of man, in connection with which, but of relative insignificance, is death."—Pp. 75, 76.

That no such sense as this is in the Scriptures ascribed to these phrases can scarcely need to be proved, nor that they do not admit of such a meaning. First, Mr. Lee asserts that the coming of the Lord from heaven to this world, means the *departure* of the disembodied soul of man, or souls of men, from this world to heaven, or the world of

spirits. But that is to make an act of God the representative of a change of which man is the subject; which is incongruous and impossible. An act of God cannot directly denote or be the representative of an effect of which man is passively or in any other form the subject. There is no analogy between them. They have the greatest possible dissimilarity in nature and relations. Next, it is to make a coming of God to the earth the representative or medium of expressing a movement of the soul in the opposite direction, from earth to the world of spirits; which on the supposition that an act of God might denote an effect of which man is the subject, would be against analogy and incongruous. Those movements are contrary to each other, not alike. Thirdly, it is to make the public, visible, and glorious coming of Jehovah to the earth, the expression of an invisible and unglorious passage of the soul from the earth to the unseen world, which is contradictious and solecistical. It is as impossible, therefore, that such an act of God should be the representative or expression of such a dis-

ential upon the practical convictions as is now the sense of sight," nor that "the Saviour will *appear*," "the angels and the spirits of just men made perfect," and "all the realities of the spiritual world," p. 75. The expressions in which he imagines propositions like these are taught, have only to be pronounced "figuratively descriptive," and treated as he treats the predictions of Christ's coming, and all his supposed "group of facts" "connected with the death of the body" vanishes from his hands. He cannot, on the ground he occupies, prove that there is a spiritual world. He cannot furnish a particle of evidence that the soul survives the body. There is not a solitary truth in the Bible of which we can have any certainty, if the language in which it is taught may justly be wrested from its grammatical sense, and its genuine meaning assumed to be something of which that is a mere vehicle or representative. The mode, however, in which Mr. Lee affects to establish his point is not the citation of passages that directly affirm it, but the gratuitous assumption of what he professes to prove by them, or the arbitrary imputation to them of a meaning that is wholly foreign to their proper sense.

Thus, in one class of passages which he alleges, wishes are expressed that believers may be kept "blameless unto the coming of the Lord Jesus," or they are exhorted to keep his commandments until his appearing, to look for his coming, and to be patient and steadfast because it was drawing nigh; and he assumes from the fact that his coming did not take place during their lives, nor for a long time after, that that language does not denote his coming, but their death, when their watching, and obeying, and looking, in this world would terminate. But that is wholly unauthorized. The fact that Christ did not come during their lives was no reason that they should not, in anticipation of his coming, keep themselves blameless, look for his appearing, and watch for it. As the *time* of his coming was withheld from them, and they were only forewarned that he is to come, and is to come unexpectedly to the world generally, the attitude of perpetual meditation of it and looking forward to it with earnest desire, was that manifestly which it became them to take. As it is to be an epoch of the greatest interest to them, when their resurrection from death is to take

place, if they die, and their change to immortal, if yet in life, and they are to be finally judged and receive their everlasting awards in his kingdom, it was natural and suitable that they should contemplate it with awe, earnest expectation, and watchfulness. To have regarded it without emotion, to have lived without a perpetual reference to it, would have indicated ignorance of its great significance, or indifference to the vast blessings with which they are then to be crowned.

Other passages he attempts to wrest to his purpose by ascribing to them a sense which they will not bear. Such is the following. "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself."—Phil. iii. 20, 21. This is so palpably against him that he appears to have been at a loss how to wrench it to his purpose by a direct construction, and to have thought it best therefore to leave his readers to take it for granted that it confirms his doctrine. For he only says in comment on it:—"This earnest

of the soul from this vile body by death, and introduction into a new and higher mode of existence; where it will either experience a development of new perceptive powers, or receive the gift of another and superior body. The body of which the change of form is promised, is *this identical body* in which we now live; not a different one, that is not to belong to us in this life.

He is more unreserved in his perversion of 2 Thess. i. 6–10.

"It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed), in that day."

"When this rest begins, begins also the punishment with everlasting destruction of the wicked.—If the former so also the latter begins with the close of life—when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels.

"The difficulty with the objector is to reconcile the *bold imagery* of this language with the event of death. But it should be remembered that *the theory of these pages* makes death, with its associate facts—the Anastasis, the Parousia, the Judgment—the great and all important event of our being, and if on any subject, the writer, whose style had been formed under the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures, would employ the terms of a sublime imagery, it would be on this very subject—of all others in the Bible."—Pp. 91–92.

He thus attempts to wrest the passage to his purpose by the pretext that it is figurative. But what figure is there in it, or group of figures, that turns all its principal terms from their literal, to a wholly dissimilar and opposite meaning? None whatever. Mr. Lee does not indicate any. He does not attempt to show that its chief expressions, or any of them, or any of their terms, are used by the metaphor, metonymy, hypocatastasis, allegory, or any other figure; nor could he, had he undertaken it. There is not a trace of

a figure of any kind in it. There is not a passage in the Bible more demonstrably literal throughout. His pretext of "the bold imagery of the language," and "the terms of a sublime imagery, formed under the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures," is the mere trick of a pedant; or else, what is far worse, an endeavor under a show of lofty words, to veil a deliberate attempt to fasten on it a false meaning.

But supposing the passage were as tropical as Mr. Lee would have us believe, and involved one or many figures, it would not follow that they would make it the vehicle of the sense which he ascribes to it. So far from it, we may safely challenge him legitimately to deduce from it the doctrine he affects to find in it, on the supposition that it is used by one or any number of the known figures of language. Let him, for the sake of the trial, assume it to be metaphorical, metonymical, hyperbolical, or representative by the hypocatastasis or the allegory, or that some or all of these or any other known figures exist in it, and he will find himself unable to make it by the legitimate laws of

mentous acts of Jehovah which the Spirit of inspiration employed it to express! What inimitable delicacy! Yet why not yield Mr. Lee what he claims here as well as anywhere else? If, as he maintains throughout, God is to be struck out of these prophecies to make way for man, why should he not surrender his place on this occasion, and Mr. Lee be allowed to make his word the instrument of teaching and proving whatever he pleases? It is only openly claiming what he has in fact assumed all along.

In his attempt to reconcile 2 Thess. ii. 1–9 with his theory he seems to have deemed a false translation necessary. We give the passage as rendered by Dean Alford:

"But we entreat you, brethren, concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering together to him, in order that ye should not be lightly shaken from your mind nor troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by epistle as from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord is present. Let no man deceive you in any manner, for (that day shall not come) unless there have come the apostasy first and there have been revealed the man of sin, the son of perdition, he that withstands and exalts himself above every one that is called God, or an object of adoration; so that he sits in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. And now ye know that which hinders in order that he may be revealed in his own time. For the mystery already is working of lawlessness only until he that now hinders be removed, and then shall be revealed the lawless one whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the breath of his mouth, and annihilate by the appearance of his coming."

A more direct and emphatic confutation of Mr. Lee's theory than this passage presents, cannot well be imagined. In the first place, the aim of the apostle's entreaty of the Thessalonians, in respect to the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, was to prevent them from being troubled by representations they might have heard that it had *already taken place.* But how, if his coming was, as Mr. Lee maintains, their removal from the world by death, could they be troubled by a representation that it had already happened? Were not the Thessalonians able to tell whether they had passed by death into the world of spirits or not? Next, the consideration which the apostle employed to prevent the Thes-

salonians from disquiet, was the assurance that that day would not come except the apostasy should first come and the man of sin be revealed, who they were aware had not yet appeared in the world; and they were aware also, he reminds them, of what it was that hindered and was still to hinder his revelation of himself. Thirdly, he apprises them that when that hindering power, which is undoubtedly the series of rulers in the Roman empire who legalize a different religion from that which the man of sin is to establish, is removed, then will that lawless one be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the breath of his mouth, and annihilate by the brightness of his coming; thus by the mode of the lawless one's destruction, showing that the coming and revelation of the Lord Jesus are to be literal and visible. For if, as Mr. Lee holds, the death of the man of sin must take place before the Lord Jesus can be revealed to him and breathe on him his consuming breath, then his destruction will be in his death simply, and will take place before the brightness of Christ's revelation of himself and

not by the prospect of the speedy coming of the Lord, but rather by the fear of delay." But if that was the ground of their trouble, how was the apostle's logic adapted to remove it? He proceeds to show, not only that the day of the Lord had not already come, but that it was not to come until a great series of events had happened that was to occupy a period of whose length they had no exact information; it might be many years, it might be ages. Mr. Lee's translation and construction thus turn the apostle's statements into proofs that the Thessalonians ought to be troubled and discouraged, because the day of the Lord was, for aught they could know, at a distance that rendered it wholly improbable that they could survive till it arrived. How, moreover, is this representation to be reconciled with Mr. Lee's theory that the day of the Lord was to the Thessalonians individually the day of their death? Could they have been troubled with the apprehension that that was at too great a distance? On a subsequent page, however, he represents them as troubled by the apprehension that the day of the Lord would not come at all; not that it would not arrive till after a long period. "The Thessalonians are solemnly admonished *not to give* UP *their belief in the great* FACT *of the Appearing and Kingdom of Christ*, and are assured that the day of the Lord is near."—P. 103. But if, as he maintains, the day of the Lord was held by them to be the day of their death, and of the appearing of Christ, and their vision of him in the spiritual world, how could the Thessalonians need a solemn admonition not to give up their belief in the great *fact* of his appearing and kingdom? Can they have had misgivings in regard to the certainty that they were to die? Can they have imagined it probable or possible that they were to continue through eternal ages in their natural frail suffering life? If that were their fear; if they regarded death as so exceedingly desirable, how happened it that they had a short time before, 1 Thess. iv. 13–18, contemplated the death of their friends with dismay; as though by their removal from the world before Christ's coming, they had lost the blessings of a resurrection in glory?

Mr. Lee perverts and falsifies in an equal measure the next branch of the passage. Paul alleges as a proof that

the day of the Lord had not already arrived, that it was to be preceded by an apostasy and the revelation of the man of sin, that had not yet taken place. Mr. Lee alters it so as to make the apostle intimate that it was of no moment to the Thessalonians whether the apostasy and revelation of the Lawless one preceded the day of the Lord or not—thereby implying that the Thessalonians were agitated by the apprehension that the apostasy and advent of the Man of Sin would not take place till after the day of the Lord had passed! "Let no one deceive you by any means"—he renders it, "for if the apostasy do not first come, and the wicked man be not revealed—the son of perdition, who puts himself in opposition and exalts himself above all that is called God—*what then?*" This plainly proceeds on the supposition—if the day of the Lord means the day of death—that the Thessalonians regarded it as of the utmost importance to them that the apostasy and revelation of the man of sin should take place before they were called from the world by death. But what conceivable reason could they have

confutation—the annihilation of his pretexts that he is God, and his destruction as the man of sin who seats himself in the temple of God and demands a religious homage from men, is to be accomplished by his death, not by what follows that event. As he will go into the invisible world a helpless subject of God's power, divested of all but what truly belongs to him; no usurped prerogative or false pretext will remain to be struck from his hands after his arrival in that world. The brightness of Christ's coming or presence, by which he is to be divested of all his usurped power, is to take place therefore in this world, and the breath of Christ's mouth, by which he is to be destroyed, is to be breathed on him here. They are acts and manifestations of which the personal and visible presence of Christ is a necessary condition. It is incongruous and solecistical to suppose they can take place in any other mode.

Such are the lawless and self-confuting expedients to which Mr. Lee resorts to erase from the Sacred Word the great doctrine of Christ's second coming, wrought into the whole fabric of the New Testament, and taught in a greater number of passages, and presented in a greater variety of attitudes and relations than any other that relates to the future measures of his administration. We might exemplify his utter unreliableness by pointing out equal errors in his construction of other passages, but these are sufficient to show that he accomplishes nothing but the confutation of himself.

IV. He denies with equal boldness that there is to be hereafter any general judgment of the good or the evil, the living or dead, and maintains that the only judgment of which men are the subjects takes place to each one immediately after death. He offers, however, no proof of either of those propositions. His whole show of reasoning lies simply in a mere assumption or assertion that the passages he cites teach what he ascribes to them.

1. Thus he alleges no proof that there is not to be a general judgment of the living and dead, at a time that is yet future. Nor can he produce from the Scriptures any evidence that there is not. No passage exists in them that presents such an announcement or intimation, either directly or by implication. Instead, there are many that openly

declare, and still more that clearly imply, that there is to be such a day of the judgment of men.

2. He offers no proof that all individuals, or any, are *finally* judged immediately after death. He had none to offer. There is no passage in the sacred word that presents such a doctrine. There are many that teach that both the good and the evil are to be publicly judged at periods long subsequent to their entrance by death into the invisible world.

3. He contradicts the established and indubitable usage of language in respect to the terms by which periods and epochs of future events are expressed and defined, and treats them as having no significance whatever. Thus, on his theory, "the day of the Lord," "the day of judgment," "the day appointed by God in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he has ordained," and other similar phrases, do not, according to Mr. Lee, indicate any specific time whatever, in distinction from other times. A day in which he will judge the world,

be judged at a specified future time, he resorts to the most lawless and unjustifiable methods. We give one or two specimens. Christ declares, "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and THEN shall he give to every one according to his works."—Matt. xvi. 27. The time of his giving to every one according to his works, is here defined as the time when the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels. It is to be distinguished from all other periods by that great public act, the personal visible descent of the Son of Man from heaven to earth, in the glory of Jehovah, and accompanied by his angels. How now does Mr. Lee affect to evade this revelation of a judgment of all men at a specific future time? Not by denying that there was to be a judgment of every man that was then future. For he admits that. "He will reward every man according to his works, and he is to do it THEN, that is, when he shall have been inducted into office."—P. 125. How then does he escape it? By denying that Christ is ever to come to the earth in the glory of his Father with his angels; and thereby denying that there is ever to be such a *time* as the passage describes for a general judgment. And this he accomplishes by virtually striking out the prediction, "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels;" and inserting in its place, "Each one shall, at death, go from the earth to the world of spirits, and shall there find himself possessed of perceptive powers, by which he shall see the Son of Man in his glory with his angels; and will then receive a reward according to his works." He thus achieves his object solely by rejecting Christ's prediction, and fabricating a wholly different one in its place: for no two propositions in the compass of language are more palpably and totally unlike, than Christ's, which he rejects, and that which he substitutes in its place. It is not a modification of Christ's; but the direct reverse of it.

In his treatment of 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2, he fails of his object, even yielding him the mistranslation to which he resorts. It is rendered by Mr. Ellicott thus—the "at," following the most authoritative manuscripts, being omitted: "I solemnly charge *thee* before God, and Christ Jesus who shall hereafter judge the quick and the dead, and by his appearing

and his kingdom—preach the word." Mr. Alford gives it thus: "I adjure thee before God and Christ Jesus who is about to judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom, proclaim the word." Here, as in the authorized version, Timothy is the object of the charge or adjuration, and the aim of the charge is to prompt him to preach the word. Mr. Lee translates it so as to make appearing and kingdom the object of the verb rendered charge. "I solemnly declare to you—(before God and the Lord Jesus Christ who is about to judge the living and the dead), his appearing and his kingdom. Preach the word." He thus strikes out the connexion between the direction to preach the word, and the charge that precedes it, and makes the one irrespective of the other. Of this, however, he seems to have been unaware; as in his comment he treats appearing and kingdom as though employed as motives to the preaching. "Of the appearing and the kingdom in its glory of Jesus Christ, we have spoken in a former chapter. *An appeal to it as a motive* was common with

appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he has ordained." This is an explicit affirmation that God has appointed a day—a specific period—in which, in contradistinction from all others, he will judge the world, that is, its population, and its whole population; for τὴν οἰκουμένην, put by metonymy for the population inhabiting it, denotes its whole inhabitants, as much as taken literally it denotes the whole habitable earth. How does Mr. Lee endeavor to escape it? By translating ἡμέρα, day, tribunal—a sense it never has in the Bible nor any other book; then asserting that ἔστησεν is never used to mean to appoint, in reference to the future, which is equally mistaken, and would yield him no relief were it true; and finally, mistranslating the expression rendered in the authorized version "he will judge," by changing it from the future to the present: "God has instituted a tribunal (ἡμέραν, as in 1 Cor. iv. 3, ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας, *a human tribunal*), at which he *is now ready* (μελλει) to judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has definitively constituted." But the expression ἀνθρωπινης ἡμέρας, 1 Cor. iv. 3, does not denote a human tribunal, but a human or man's day—that is, a day of man's judgment; just as "the day of the Lord" is the day of the Lord's judgment. Mr. Lee fails, therefore, in his attempt to wrench from the passage the declaration that God has appointed a day—a specific period—in discrimination from all others, in which he will judge the world. His assertion that the verb ἔστησεν does not signify to appoint with a reference to the future, but to establish at the present, is equally mistaken. Were it true, it would yield him no support, as it is not that verb that expresses the future, but μελλει. He has appointed a day in which he will judge the world. As the act of judging is to be exerted in the day he has appointed for it, and that act is declared by the verb μελλει to be future, the day in which it is to be exerted is also future. His attempt, moreover, to change the time from the future to the present, is as fatal to his aim as it is false to the language. For if, as he represents, the time appointed for the judgment was only "the present," that is, the time that was contemporaneous with the appointment itself of the day, then it admitted of no judgment of the world after that time, and

thence precluded it altogether, inasmuch as Christ's appointment to his office as Judge, was, like his appointment to be slain from the foundation of the world, before the man was called into existence. And finally, as this absurd pretext is in effect a denial of the judgment itself, so his change of μελλει from the future to the present is a denial of the certainty that a judgment was to take place. To say "He has instituted a tribunal at which *he is now ready* to judge the world," is not to assert that he will judge it; it is simply to declare his readiness. Whether it is his purpose immediately to judge, and whether the subjects of the judgment are ready, are left undetermined. The methods by which Mr. Lee endeavors to get rid of a specific future day of judgment are thus not only unjustifiable, but would, if legitimate, set aside the certainty which the passage proclaims, that God is to judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he has ordained.

Other passages are treated in the same lawless manner; but we pass to his denial of the resurrection.

2. The grave is exhibited as the scene of the resurrection, and those who lie there as its subjects. "The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life: and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."—John v. 28, 29.

3. The resurrection of Christ, which was of the same nature as that of his saints is to be, was a resurrection of his body. His body that was raised, was identically that which expired on the cross, and was laid in the tomb. His resurrection took place in the tomb. He came out of the tomb in his revivified body, appeared in it to his disciples, and finally ascended in it to heaven. This Mr. Lee admits, P. 181. And Christ's resurrection is everywhere exhibited as of the same nature as that of his people—that is, a resurrection of the body that died. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become a first fruit of them that have fallen asleep. For since death is by man, by man also is the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."—1 Cor. xv. 20–22. "He that raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus."—2 Cor. iv. 14. "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power."—1 Cor. vi. 14. The effect to be wrought in us, is thus exhibited as the same as was wrought in Christ—namely a restoration of the dead body to life. The consequence that is to result from his work as head of the race, is directly the reverse of that which sprung from Adam's headship. As all die a corporeal death in consequence of Adam's transgression, so all are to be raised up to a corporeal life in consequence of Christ's obedience. And this resurrection of all, by Christ, is here and everywhere else exhibited as future. "In Christ shall all be made alive." "He that raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus."

4. In the symbolical representations accordingly of the resurrection of the dead, it is exhibited as a corporeal resurrection. Thus the two witnesses that were slain, were raised to corporeal life. They stood upon their feet, were visible to the living who were present, and were taken up into heaven. The holy dead, also, raised at the commencement of the thousand years—lived, it is said, during the thousand

years, in contradistinction from the rest of the dead, who lived not during that period. (Rev. xx. 4, 5.) That is, instead of remaining corporeally dead, they were raised to a new corporeal life. And in the resurrection of the unholy after the end of the thousand years, the sea gave up the dead that were in it, and death and the grave delivered up the dead that were in them, and they were judged every one according to his works. (Rev. xx. 11–13.)

And with these representations all the other passages that treat of the subject are in harmony. It is impossible, therefore, that we should have a higher measure of certainty through the medium of language or symbols, that the resurrection of which all are to be subjects, is a resurrection of their bodies that died, to a fresh life. Mr. Lee may exhaust all his powers in framing propositions to declare that the resurrection is to be a corporeal one, and he will find himself unable to form one that shall affirm it more clearly and emphatically, than it is taught in these and other similar passages.

ings of the Bible, does Mr. Lee endeavor to establish this theory? Not by any express testimony of the sacred word. There is no passage in the Scriptures that defines the resurrection as a mere continued subsistence of the mind in another mode of being, or with a development of new perceptive powers. There is none that declares that the resurrection is not to be a literal revivification of the body that is dead. He resorts, as on his other themes, to the indirect methods on which errorists necessarily rely—of assumption, insinuation, false construction, and the bold assertion of that which he cannot prove.

Thus he avers that there is no intimation in the Old Testament of the resurrection of the body, and to prove it, attempts to fasten a false sense on the prediction, Dan. xii. 2, 3, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." No terms could have been chosen that could make it more indubitably certain that the event foreshown here is a literal corporeal resurrection of the dead.

Mr. Lee, however, denies it, first under the pretext of "the boldest imagery." "This is supposed by many to refer to the resurrection. But it is surprising that in a connexion where the boldest imagery is all along employed in predicting the future, this particular portion should be construed literally." By "the boldest imagery" he, probably, by mistake, means symbols. But the passage is not symbolic. The sleepers were not seen in vision by the prophet awaking from the dust, some to everlasting life, and some to contempt. The awaking and the shining of the wise as the brightness of the firmament, and of those who turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever, are predicted as future—not narrated as past—as though they had taken place under the eye of the prophet, as they would have been, had they been presented as symbols. Had the awaking, indeed, been used as a symbol, it would have represented a real resurrection of the dead, as that is the relation in which the resurrection of dead persons is used as a symbol in the other Scriptures, as in Rev. xi. 8–12; xx. 4–6, and 11–15. In

these, which are all the examples of the use of the symbol in the New Testament, it denotes the resurrection of the bodies of dead persons of the same class—holy or unholy—as the symbols themselves were; and of necessity, as it cannot, by the law of analogy, represent anything else. What could the resurrection of the impenitent dead to shame denote, but a real resurrection of the impenitent? It could not represent a moral resurrection to evil of such persons. They are, by the supposition, already evil. The passage, however, instead of symbolic, is figurative, and its figures make it more certain, if possible, than literal terms could, that the resurrection it foretells is a corporeal one. The term sleep is used by a metaphor to denote the unconsciousness and repose in which the dead lie, resembling that of living persons in slumber; and their sleeping in the dust of the earth defines their sleep as that of death. The verb awake is also used by a metaphor in harmony with the metaphorical use of sleep—to denote a resurrection of the body from death to life, as it is defined indeed in the expression, some shall awake to everlasting life. That

to a distant future—the end of the world. The burden of the visions that Daniel saw, was the then future history of the Jews. The interpreter was sent to tell him what was to befall his people in the latter day." P. 151. But the time of the end was not, as Mr. Lee imagines, the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, nor of the destruction of Jerusalem and dispersion of the Jews by the Romans, but the time of their final deliverance from the captivity into which they were to be led by the Romans, and re-establishment as God's people in their land. The great tribulation foretold by Daniel, xii. 1, is expressly shown by the use of his language in describing it, to be the tribulation of that captivity through its whole period to the end of the times of the Gentiles immediately before Christ's second coming. Matt. xxiv. 21, 29, 30; Luke xxi. 24–28. The prediction of deliverance from that tribulation and the resurrection of many of the dead, is accordingly directly connected with a prophecy of the destruction of the hostile Gentile power in its last form, which, we know from other prophecies, is to take place at Christ's second coming. Zech. xiv. 1–5; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Rev. xix. 11–21. "The connexion of thought," therefore, and "the burden of the visions," in place of forbidding, require us to regard it as referring to the end of the Gentile age, when Christ is to establish his kingdom on the earth, and raise his saints who sleep in the dust to reign with him in it in glory. Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27; Rev. xx. 4–6.

And finally, he interprets "the language," expressing the resurrection as indicating "the coming in of the Christian dispensation, and the effect of the means of grace in Christ Jesus upon the world, Gentiles as well as Jews." But that is incompatible with the imagery. If, as Mr. Lee assumes, the dead bodies in the dust represent the impenitent as spiritually dead, then their continuance in impenitence, and plunge into deeper sin, cannot be represented by an awaking to consciousness and activity. It would be a descent into a profounder slumber, a removal to a still greater distance from all that belongs to spiritual life. Mr. Lee thus, instead of accomplishing his object, only shows that he undertakes to treat of topics of which he has no proper comprehension.

In his interpretation of passages in the New Testament a

principal aim is to prove that Anastasis, the resurrection, instead of denoting a restoration of the dead body to life, signifies only the continued existence of the soul, after death. He cites for that purpose Matt. xxii. 31, 32: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living!" Mr. Lee maintains that anastasis, the resurrection, is here used in the mere sense of the continued existence of the mind after death, on the ground that as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had not been literally raised from death, if their continued subsistence as spirits was not what is meant by resurrection, God could not, according to Christ's words, be their God. He is, however, mistaken. Christ did not aim to prove by the words he quoted, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had actually been raised from the dead, but simply that they were still in existence, and therefore that their resurrection was possible. And that was all that was re-

rity and against the indubitable meaning of the language. It is demonstrable from the terms that they cannot have that signification, as that is not their literal meaning. If they were used in that sense, it would be by some figure. But there is no figure by which, in the connexion in which they are used, they could have that meaning, inasmuch as it is against analogy. The term anastasis literally denotes *a rising up*, as from a prostrate to an erect position; and is expressive, therefore, of the natural movement of a body in the grave, awaked to a new life, and rising from a recumbent to an erect posture. The verb εγειρω—also, to wake, to rouse, to raise, usually employed to express Christ's act in raising the dead, denotes the rousing, that is, restoring them to life, and raising them from a prostrate to an erect posture; and expresses accordingly the identical effect that would be produced in raising the dead out of the grave. If these terms then were supposed to be used by a metaphor in the passages in question, to denote an effect produced on the disembodied mind, instead of the dead body, that effect could not possibly be a mere continuance of the mind in existence; as that would not present any analogy to the act or effect whence the metaphor was taken. In order that the effect wrought in the mind might resemble the raising of a dead body to life, it must be a rousing and raising of the mind from a state analogous to that of the body in death; and that is a state of absolute inactivity and unconsciousness. It would imply, therefore, that the mind sank at death into a state of total unconsciousness, resembling the senselessness and lifelessness of the body in death. But that implies that its reviviscence is to take place a considerable, perhaps a long period after death—as the predicted resurrection of the body is,—and thence—as none of the predictions of the resurrection of the body are to be verified till the second coming of Christ, that all the supposed resurrections of minds are also yet unaccomplished; and that the whole succession of souls that have passed through death, are locked in as absolute inactivity and insensibility as their bodies are that are slumbering in the grave! Mr. Lee's attempt to make these passages predictions of the resurrection of souls instead of bodies, thus defeats itself. It implies that death consigns them to a sleep as dreamless

and dark as that of the grave is to their dust; and thence puts it out of his power to prove that any of the infinite host, except Christ, and those that rose corporeally at his resurrection, have been awakened from that slumber.

The result will be the same if, instead of supposing the terms to be used by a metaphor, he assumes that the act of raising a dead body, or the process of a bodily resurrection, is used as a representative of an analogous resurrection of the mind after death: for as in order to analogy, the state from which the mind is supposed to be raised, must be like that of the dead body, it must be a state of inactivity and unconsciousness: Mr. Lee proceeds in it therefore on the implication that death consigns the soul to a sleep and unconsciousness as profound as that of the body in death, and that it continues in that state, until waked from it by a divine interposition as miraculous as a resurrection of a dead body to life is by divine power. And thence as the predictions of the resurrection of the bodies of the dead are all in the future, and have not yet had their accomplish-

sition of a moral resurrection of the impenitent is therefore a self-contradiction, and shows that Mr. Lee is wholly unaware of the meaning of the terms he employs.

But he declares dogmatically that "we learn nothing" from the passage "about the resurrection, in the ordinary use of the word." "Any question relating to the resurrection was not and *could not* be under consideration here. By 'all that are in the graves' is meant the dead, or those in the unseen world."—Pp. 168, 169. But if the language has no relation to the bodies of the dead; if by "all that are in the sepulchres," is meant the spirits solely of the dead, "in the unseen world," then does it not follow indisputably either that the sepulchres here where the bodies lie, are "the unseen world" where the spirits have their residence, or else that there are sepulchres in the invisible world in which they have their abode? For it is expressly declared that those who are to hear Christ's voice and come forth, are in the sepulchres, and that it is from the sepulchres that they are to come forth either to life or to condemnation. If, then, as Mr. Lee asserts, the bodies of the dead are not the subject of the prediction and could not be, but their souls, exclusively, it is clear that their souls are in the sepulchres, and thence if not in those in this world, in other sepulchres in the invisible scene where they dwell: and in either case it is implied that they are consigned by death to inactivity and the loss of consciousness; and consequently that as Mr. Lee is unable to prove that any of them have as yet been awaked from that sleep, his whole theory of the life of the soul after death falls to the ground.

He falls into still more portentous errors in his theory of Christ's resurrection. He admits that Christ actually rose from the dead, by the revivification of his body which expired on the cross and was laid in the sepulchre."

"He died; was buried; his body did not see corruption; it was miraculously revivified on the third day—the wounds upon his side and hands yet unhealed and open; he appeared to his friends and suddenly and miraculously vanished out of their sight; he ate, and drank, and spoke, and walked; and finally in a miraculous manner, rose up bodily—the same body as far as the disciples could see in which he had appeared after his resurrection."—P. 181.

But this resurrection of Christ's body, he holds, was not a resurrection to immortal life, but was only for a few days, and for purposes wholly unlike a resurrection to immortality and glory.

"The great object of the appearing of Christ to his disciples after his death was unquestionably to secure upon their unmetaphysical minds a deep and practical conviction that he was still alive; and too not a mere ghost of scarcely actual being, but that he lived a vigorous glorious life, and would be to them an actual and available and present Saviour. . . . . These convictions secured by the facts of his peculiar *post-mortem* life—being present and vanishing, and reappearing and vanishing again, showing that though unseen he was yet present—he then might have retired in spirit from this world in a method unrecognised by sense. Or he might even, to impress upon their minds that he was going to heaven to be seen no more, have gone up as he did in fact in palpable manifestation, a cloud receiving him out of their sight. The animal body had answered its purposes, and the spirit might now take its departure into the Spiritual world

died except for sin, he must have died because of his having transgressed the divine law. But if he died as a personal sinner he must still remain under the curse of sin; and if a sinner, and under the curse, what can be more certain than that he cannot reign on the throne of heaven as the beloved of the Father and be the redeemer of men! Mr. Lee's scheme thus blasphemes the spotless Saviour in the most shocking manner, and overturns the whole work of redemption.

We might point out many other passages in which he misrepresents and perverts the teachings of the Bible, but having reached this climax of error and impiety in which his system terminates, it is not necessary to pursue it farther. We will only add, that he takes no notice of the reasons that the second coming and reign of Christ on the earth, the resurrection of the dead, and the public judgment of the dead and the living, are essential in order to accomplish the redemption of the race in the perfection God contemplates, and to the vindication of his ways towards them in the eyes of the universe. He rather jeers at such measures as unnatural, useless, and far less becoming the Almighty than the scheme of procedure *he* ascribes to him. Though clearly taught in the Scriptures, Mr. Lee does not see that the wisdom, righteousness, love, and glory of Christ may require that, after having reigned on the throne of heaven many ages, and brought all his unfallen subjects to a knowledge of himself in his incarnate nature and work as the Redeemer of men, he should then come to the earth and, conquering and destroying by his own hand the great enemies who have possession of it and war on him and his kingdom, directly himself exert the administration under which the race is to be raised from the degradation and misery of sin to the beauty and blessedness of God's children. Mr. Lee does not see that death, being the penalty of sin, the resurrection of the identical body that dies to an immortal and glorious life is essential in order to the redemption of those who are saved from that curse; that to continue for ever under the power of death would be to continue for ever under the penalty of sin, and imply, therefore, that Christ's work was not adequate to the full forgiveness and deliverance of those whom he saves, or else that he never con-

templated their full pardon and release from the curse, and would therefore reflect dishonor on him. Mr. Lee supposes if but half our nature is saved, and the other remains under the ignominy of the curse for ever, our salvation will be as complete and glorious to Christ as though our whole being were redeemed and raised to a resplendence and majesty fitting us to dwell in his immediate presence and fill the most august offices in his kingdom. Nor does he see that the public judgment of both the righteous and the unrighteous, at the time when they receive their final award, may be essential to the demonstration to the universe of God's righteousness, wisdom, and goodness; nor that that judgment should in part be postponed until Christ has reigned for such a period in power over the world that all the measures and modes of his administration have been exemplified, on an adequate scale, in order that the question as to God's justice, and goodness, and truth, in regard to all individuals of the race who are saved or have perished, may, at that trial, be for ever settled, and the mouth of the ene-

striking from the words of God the sense he employs them to express, and infusing some poor and false meaning he himself has invented in its place!

We scarcely need to say that his work is not of any critical value. There is not a single element of his peculiar theory that he has succeeded in sustaining: there is not a single passage of the sacred word on which he has thrown any fresh light. He is unacquainted with the most essential laws of language, and has only learning enough to give in the eye of the superficial a slight air of authority to his errors. Yet, notwithstanding his rejection of so many of its important doctrines, he claims that his theory is consistent with the fundamental truths of revelation. We have seen, however, that his assumptions, and assertions, if pushed to their legitimate results, overturn the whole work of redemption, and blot out the hope of a future life; and the manner generally in which he treats the word of God, is as reprehensible as his denial of specific truths. If the principles on which he proceeds in his interpretations are legitimate, there is not a doctrine of the divine word that may not be set aside, and its place supplied by a self-contradictious and fatal error. No one, indeed, can accept his principles, and follow him in their application, unless it be under the feeling that the Bible is an equivocal book, and that the interpreter may put on it whatever construction he pleases. Its influence, therefore, can only be mischievous, and thence the quicker it passes to oblivion, the better for the public and the happier for him.

Art. II.—Notes on Scripture.

Matthew xxii. 15–xxiii. 12.

Matt. xxii. 15–46 (see also Mark xii. 13–37; Luke xx. 20–44). The parables of the vineyard and of the marriage of the king's son, form a fitting conclusion of our Lord's public instructions as a teacher, whether we regard him as the Messiah or Son of Man. The people had rejected him in

both characters, and nothing belonging to his public functions remained but his sacrificial work. Why, then, it may be inquired, was the rest of this chapter added? Are we to regard it as miscellaneous matter, without coherence between its parts or with the preceding context, and as having been recorded only on account of its intrinsic importance; or is there a logical connexion between its different parts and the instruction of the parables?

It would be impossible to over-estimate the importance of this portion of the chapter; and this consideration alone, if there were no others, would be a sufficient reason for recording it; yet, if we consider it (especially those parts which contain the words of the Saviour) in connexion with the preceding parables, we shall perceive a continuity of thought which reveals a special design, and may guide us in the interpretation of the entire passage. This will appear, if we bear in mind the following particulars:

(1.) In these parables Jesus had announced to the people the momentous truth that God would take away from them

Sadducees. In the question which he proposed to the Pharisees, touching the Sonship and Lordship of Christ, we shall discover an allusion to the denial of his divine rights and His rejection by the nation at that time. Bearing these considerations in mind, we proceed with the exposition.

Matt. xxii. 15. "Then went the Pharisees and took counsel together, how they might entangle him in his talk," [ensnare him in discourse.]

The scene is still in the temple, and the time, the last day of our Lord's public ministry. The parable of the two sons (xxi. 28-32) and of the vineyard (33–44), greatly provoked the Priests and Pharisees; so much so, that they would have laid hands on him immediately, had they not been restrained by their fears of the people (vs. 46). At the conclusion of the parable of the vineyard, it is probable (see Mark xii. 12) they retired to some part of the temple, to consult and concert a plan, by which they might destroy him, without personal danger; leaving him alone with the people, while he delivered to them the parable of the marriage. This connexion of the verse with the last verse of the preceding chapter, is made obvious by Luke xx. 18, 19, 20. The plan they agreed upon was to substitute fraud or craft for violence, disguising their design by flattery.

Of course it was indispensable to success that they should not personally appear in the matter; for after the severe denunciation they had received, and perhaps the displeasure they had shown, it was not to be supposed they could address him so soon, with words of commendation and praise without being suspected of insincerity. So they would naturally reason. They selected, therefore, persons, probably of less note than themselves; perhaps not of their own body, but such as favored their principles and shared in their malice—disciples (μαθητὰς) as Matthew calls them;—trained insidious men (ἐγκαθέτους) as Luke calls them (xx. 12), to whom they joined some Herodians; so called, because they were the domestics, or courtiers, or soldiers of Herod. (See the Syriac version.) Having concerted their plan they watched (παρατηρήσαντες, Luke xx. 20) for an opportunity to carry it into effect. It occurred when the Lord had finished his last parable (Matt. xxii. 1–14) and (as we may suppose) as he was upon the point of departing finally

from the temple. If this be a correct view of the circumstances, a good deal that follows in this and the next chapter occurred apparently in consequence of the detention, after the close of his public formal address with which his ministry was concluded; although we might properly add to the parables the last three verses of chapter xxiii., in which he apostrophizes, with inimitable pathos, the doomed city and her children. But these are conjectures on which we will not dwell.

Verse 16. "And they sent out" from their conclave or place of consultation "unto him their disciples"—disciples of theirs—"with Herodians, saying: Master, we know that thou art true"—a true sincere candid man—"and teachest the way of God in truth"—we know also that thou art a fearless man—"neither carest thou for any, for thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us therefore what thinkest thou,"—what is your judgment or opinion upon this question,—"Is it lawful"—for us Jews, who are God's chosen people, owing allegiance only to him—"to give tribute to Cæsar or not?"

We must not leave this passage without remarking, how completely our Lord's divine nature was concealed under the veil of his flesh. Had the Pharisees and Herodians known who he was, it would not have been possible for them to approach him with flattery or to entertain the vain conceit of "entangling him in his talk." They thought of him as merely a man in his nature, like themselves, though endowed as they could not avoid seeing, with extraordinary gifts of wisdom and power; yet not so transcendently wise, that he might not be overreached and ensnared; nor so powerful, that he might not be overcome. (See 1 Cor. ii. 8.)

Verses 18, 19. "But Jesus perceived their wickedness and said"—rather, But Jesus well knowing their wickedness said, John ii. 24, 25, "Why tempt ye me; hypocrites?"—Why do you try me, to ensnare me, ye dissemblers—"Show me (τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσου) the tribute money"—the coinage in which tribute is demanded by Cæsar,—"and they brought him a (denarius) penny."

The stress of our Lord's demand was laid on the *coinage* (τὸ νόμισμα), as is evident from his next question.

Verses 21, 22. "Whose is this image (εἰκὼν *effigies*) and superscription (ἐπιγραφή *inscriptio*)? They say unto him Cæsar's. Then saith he to them"—This then is Cæsar's money, and Cæsar demands tribute in his own money—"Render then unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."

It was the coinage that gave the money currency. It was that which gave it an arbitrary or nominal value, according to the will of Cæsar, independently of its intrinsic or real value, which would depend on its weight (Gen. xxiii. 16; xliii. 21; Ezra viii. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30; Job xxviii. 15; Jer. xxxii. 9; Zech. xi. 12). Consequently the currency of money (by tale) without regard to weight) of the kind and coinage produced, was a confession of the subjection of their civil or political state to Cæsar. This answer, therefore, established (at least indirectly) the lawfulness of the tribute, and virtually affirmed that the payment of it was not inconsistent, in their present and prospective condition, with their duties to God. But because he did not see proper to return a direct affirmative to the question, the priests, to whom his answer was reported, perverted it into a negative, as we learn from Luke xxiii. 2.

Some have supposed that our Lord adopted this form of answer to mitigate the odium of a direct admission of the rights of Cæsar, but the supposition cannot be admitted as even a possible one. Consider the time of this transaction. Our Lord's public ministry was ended. The doom of the nation he had just before portrayed in his matchless parables; his own suffering on the cross on the third day thereafter, were fully in his view. Why should he, had he been merely a man, desire to mitigate or soften the odium, which he foresaw was so soon to burst upon him without restraint. His motive in thus answering the question had respect (we cannot doubt) to the condition of the nation, not only at that time, but during all the ages of the present dispensation, even down to the time of his second coming. It was a solemn precept given to them at his final departure from them (Matt. xxiii. 39), for their guidance in their subject condition, as long as it should continue, which we know will be until the final restitution of the nation to the land of the covenant and their conversion. Thus we see how this answer connects itself with the parables in which he had portrayed their future history. It speaks to that people today what it spoke to those whom the Lord personally addressed: "Render to Cæsar"—the powers to which, by the just judgment of God you are subject, 1 Tim. ii. 2; Rom. xiii. 1–4—"the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."

We should degrade the subject and derogate from the majesty of our Lord, if we were to regard this answer as evasive, or as an adroit escape from a snare, although the bystanders may have so regarded it at that time. To ensnare him was not possible. (See Is. xlv. 9.) There was no equality nor approximation to equality between him and his questioners in any respect. Rather should we regard his answer as the dictate of the Divine will respecting their future conduct, not only during the short space their national state would be permitted to continue, but during their approaching dispersion among the nations. (See Jerem. xxix. 4 and 7.) It is not probable that the answer was received or understood in that intent. Certainly it was not obeyed, in the sense in which it was given, as the history of the nation until its utter overthrow under Adrian (A.D. 137) proves.

Verse 23. "The same day came to him the Sadducees which say that there is no resurrection" [nor angel nor spirit], Acts xxiii. 8.

The Sadducees were materialists. They held that the souls of men were mortal, and perished with their bodies (Josephus Jewish War, book 2, ch. 12). They denied the existence of demons, which they included under the name of angels. Their question, however, had respect only to the resurrection, and this part only of their tenets (which were thoroughly infidel) therefore is mentioned by the evangelists, or is directly noticed by the Saviour. The question they proposed was founded upon a case which, whether real or imaginary, was a possible one, and was supposed by them to involve a difficulty which would go far to prove the doctrine of the resurrection of the body an absurdity. The case put is familiar to the reader, and we need not transcribe it.

Matt. xxii. 29. "Jesus answered and said unto them, ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God."

Ignorance is a fruitful source of error. Yet of many things men are necessarily ignorant. Of the attributes, the works, and the ways of God it is but a little they can know (Job. xxvi. 14; Ps. cxxxix. 6, cxlv. 3). Hence the reasonableness and even necessity of faith in things relating to God. Yet often, and without being sensible of it, men measure the meaning of God's words by their conceptions of his power. Things marvellous in their eyes they suppose must be marvellous also in the eyes of God (Zech. xiii. 6; Gen. xviii. 14; 2 Kings vii. 2; Luke i. 20, 37; xviii. 27). They are often bold enough to adjust the scheme of his revealed purposes by their views of the fitness of things. This is a plausible, because it is a disguised, form of infidelity. In the text the Saviour ascribed this error of the Sadducees to their ignorance of God's power. It was an error of *interpretation* arising from that source; for they did not deny the authority of the Scriptures, at least of the writings of Moses; but their low views of the power of God were the cause of their misinterpretation of the Scriptures in this and probably many other particulars. If this be the correct estimate of this text, there are even now many Sadducean errors which do not pass under that name.

Verse 30. "For in the resurrection they [men] neither marry nor are [wives] given in marriage, but are (ὡς ἄγγελοι) as [the] angels of God (ἐν οὐρανῷ) in heaven."

Mark xii. 25. "For when they shall rise from the dead they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are (ὡς ἄγγελοι) as [the] angels in heaven" (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in the heavens).

Luke is yet more explicit (xx. 34–36). "The children of this world (του αιωνος τουτου) marry and are given in marriage, but they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world (τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν) and the resurrection from the dead (καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν and that resurrection which is *from among* the dead, viz. the first resurrection), neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are (ἰσάγγελοι) equal to [the] angels, and are children (υἱοι *sons*) of God, being children (υἱοὶ *sons*) of the resurrection."

The Saviour having told the Sadducees that they were in error, and the source of their error, proceeds to inform them that their question was not well conceived or put, being

the raised dead, or the incongruity of their condition with the marriage relation, may be uncertain. Perhaps he intended both. It is plain, however, from the context and other parts of Scripture that he did not intend a comparison in all respects. The subject did not call for it. Besides men and angels are, and for ever will be, different orders of creatures, and while men, dwelling on this earth and invested with bodies of flesh and blood, will for ever be inferior to the angels, yet those of the race who shall be counted worthy of the resurrection of which our Lord spoke, will, by virtue of their union to him (as we have reason to believe), be exalted to a greater glory and a more glorious inheritance than are attainable by the angels. (See 1 Cor. vi. 3; Heb. ii. 5, 7; John xvii. 22–24; and see notes Journ. viii. 97–100, and 95, 96.)

Having thus disposed of the case the Saviour might have dropped the subject; but the erroneous doctrine which suggested it, struck at the very existence of the Elect Church, the members of which, we have seen, are to constitute that nation to whom he had just before declared the kingdom of God shall be given. He, therefore, took up the main question and went on to say,

Matt. xxii. 31, 32. "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not [the] God of [the] dead [men] but of [the] living."

Mark xii. 26, 27. "And as touching the dead, that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush, God spake unto him, saying: I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. He is not the God of [the] dead [men] but [the] God of [the] living; ye therefore do greatly err."

Luke xx. 37, 38. "Now that the dead are raised [do rise] even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: For he is not [a] God of [the] dead [men] but of [the] living: for all live unto Him."

This answer silenced the Sadducees, as we learn from vs. 34. The multitude, who heard it, perceived its conclusiveness. Yet (strange to say) learned men are not agreed

wherein its force or appositeness consists. A recent commentator, after stating some of the doubts which have been raised upon the question, resolves them by supposing that the answer was not intended as an argument, but as an authoritative declaration of the truth. We regard it as both. But we are chiefly concerned with it at present as an argument, and in that light the bystanders and Sadducees regarded it.

It is usual with commentators to isolate the whole of this passage from the preceding context, and interpret it as they would in any other connexion. The case which the Sadducees stated and the question which they put upon it are totally unlike the question of the Herodians, and both equally disparate from the parables previously recorded. This is conceded. Yet if we carefully consider our Saviour's replies to these questions, in connexion with the parables, we shall perceive the same vein of thought lying underneath both, only with different modifications arising from the diversity of the subjects to which it is applied. This we have endeavored to

resurrection of all those of them who had died in faith, as the necessary or appointed means of conferring on them the covenanted blessings; consequently, if we suppose that the nation had received Jesus with the obedience of the heart (instead of rejecting him), God would have not only conferred the promised kingdom upon them, but upon all those (their ancestors) who had lived and died in the exercise of the like faith. We see not how otherwise (though we do not allege our ignorance as an argument), God could have fulfilled his covenant with them, and we are justified in assuming that he would have fulfilled it in this way, by the reasoning of the Saviour in the passage under consideration, and of the apostle in Heb. xi. 17–19. Yet such an argument, framed upon the covenant at Horeb, would have been hypothetical, inasmuch as the nation had forfeited the condition upon which the kingdom was promised. Hence our Lord fell back, if the expression may be allowed, upon the earlier covenant which God made with Abraham, and confirmed unto Isaac and Jacob, which (being absolute and unconditional in its terms) the apostle informs us (Gal. iii. 17), remained firm notwithstanding the forfeiture of the covenant made at Horeb. (See Rom. xi. 30.)

It is under this earlier covenant, which (as we have just said) is *absolute and unconditional* in its terms, that the elect nation or substituted people of which our Lord spoke (Matt. xxi. 43), are to be raised up and formed (Gal. iii. 17). This earlier covenant comprises also within its scope the covenant with David (Gal. iii. 16), which (unlike that which was made with the nation at Horeb) is also absolute and unconditional in its terms (2 Sam. xxiii. 5; Is. lv. 3; Acts xiii. 34).

The blessings promised in all these covenants are of the most exalted nature,—the gift of immortality, and, as we have seen, exaltation to thrones of glory in the times of the restitution of all things. This elect people are designated under various relations, all of which are unspeakably glorious. They are called the Redeemed of Christ, his friends, his brethren, his children, his witnesses, his bride, his members, members of his body, of his flesh, of his bones; his fellow-sufferers, fellow-kings, fellow-priests, the sons of God, sons of the resurrection, the temples of the

Holy Spirit. They are said to be one with Christ, and he their first-born brother.

These intimate relations to the Messiah, and the exalted service, under him, which such designations or descriptions imply, in the administration of the kingdom of God, are all involved in the covenants which God made with Abraham and David, as well as in the covenant which he made with the nation of Israel at Horeb, the principal difference being that in the former the promises were absolute, in the latter they were conditioned upon the obedience of the people. But if there be no resurrection of the dead, none of these privileges can be enjoyed, neither Christ nor his chosen people could be raised, and consequently the blessings forfeited by the nation were, at the best, but ephemeral in their nature, and their loss not greatly to be deplored. (See 1 Cor. xv. 32.)

The doctrine of the Sadducees, therefore, made all these covenants empty and vain things (see 1 Cor. xv. 12–18), especially in respect to those who had died in the faith, with

It is not probable that even the most learned, orthodox, and devout of the nation at that time had any proper conception of the richness and glory of these covenants, or of the particular intent with which the Saviour alleged them. They contain unfathomable mysteries (1 Cor. ii. 7–9). But they understood that the promises which God made to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob were absolute, and they believed that he would surely perform them, even to those of former generations, who had part in them; and on this ground, mainly, they taught the resurrection of the dead (see Acts xxiv. 15),* and to this extent our Lord's reply to the Sadducees confirmed it.

The words he quoted, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," conveyed a distinct

---

* Three opinions touching the resurrection prevailed to a greater or less extent among the Jews. (1) Some maintained that only the just or righteous of their nation would be raised; (2) others maintained that the whole of their race (all Israelites) would be raised; and (3) some maintained that all Israelites and *some* Gentiles would be raised. It is evident from Acts xxiv. 14, 15, that the Jews of St. Paul's day did not adopt the first of these opinions, but they appear to have limited the resurrection to their nation. In Rom. ix. 2–5, Paul teaches that the adoption (by which he meant the resurrection, Rom. viii. 23) pertained to Israelites; and hence it would seem that the resurrection, as a term of the original covenant, was limited to Israel. Rabbi Bechai says, God granted four special honors to Israel, viz: (1) the land of Canaan, (2) the law, (3) prophecy, and (4) the resurrection of the dead. Josephus, though obscure, evidently did not believe the resurrection would be universal. Yet the Pharisees held that *all souls* were immortal, and that the souls of pious Gentiles would be happy, though in a disembodied state (see Lardner Credib., bk. i. ch. 4, § i.), and that the souls of wicked Gentiles would suffer punishment in their disembodied state (see Acts xix. 15, where *a spirit* is represented as *speaking*). The philosophical Greeks, on the other hand, treated the doctrine with ridicule (Acts. xvii. 32). In Rom. ii 1–15, Paul addresses unbelieving Jews, mainly upon principles admitted by them. In the 16th verse he advances a doctrine which they denied. In vs. 7th and 10th he speaks of the rewards of well-doing, and in vs. 8th and 9th of the punishment of those who do evil. It is probable the idea of the resurrection of the body is included in the (ζωὴν αἰώνιον) eternal life spoken of in the 7th verse. However this may be, the New Testament teaches the absolute universality of the resurrection of all men, whether Jews or Gentiles. But it does not teach that all men, universally, will be raised from the dead *at one and the same time.* There is a *first* and a *second* resurrection (Rev. xx. 5, 12; Luke xiv. 14). The children of the covenant only (or that elect nation of which our Lord spoke, Matt. xxi. 43) shall have part in the first resurrection. See Harmar's Miscellaneous Works, pp. 221–264, for a more full account of the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection.

allusion to the covenant God made with those fathers,* and the avowal that he was their God, implied that he would punctually fulfil to them all He had promised. Had He promised them nothing more than the immortality of their souls, then nothing more could be inferred from this relation. But his covenant included their posterity, the Gentiles, even the world itself (Rom. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 8), and many specific blessings which (in a dispensation during which death has reigned and hitherto has passed upon all, Rom. v. 14) could not be fulfilled without raising them from the dead, in order that they may be the recipients of the covenanted blessings. To be their God, then, in the sense of the covenant, is to be their God as *living men* not as disembodied spirits. The force of the last clause (Luke xx. 38), "for all live unto him," will be perceived from the following paraphrase: "He who created all things at first out of nothing, and by whom all creatures live, wills to be a God to them, as living not as dead men. For so he interprets his own covenant with them, and nothing, not death itself, can prevent his will: for life and even being originated in

debatable one. It was a practical question, and the lawyer, no doubt, proposed it under the impression of its importance in that respect to the nation, which he took it for granted would continue still to exist, with undiminished prosperity, till Messiah should come and crown it with unwonted glory and power. Our Lord's reply, on the other hand, was framed upon a vivid and perfect apprehension of the divine purposes. The whole scheme of Providence, stretching forward to the consummation of all things, was present to his mind, and his answer, while it was perfectly apposite to the question, had a designed though unexplained reference to impending and remote events, of which the lawyer had no conception.

We interpret this answer then (as we did that to the question of the Herodians) with reference not merely to the actual posture of the nation at that time, but its future fortunes in all time to come. The people, it need not be repeated, were on the eve of their national overthrow and dispersion. Jerusalem, then standing in beauty and strength, was soon to be destroyed. The temple in which they then stood was to be utterly demolished. All their political, social, domestic, and religious ties were to be disrupted by their dispersion among the nations. A new dispensation was about to be opened, in which the ceremonial worship of the temple would, in a few years, become impracticable. To this condition our Lord alluded at the beginning of his ministry in his conversation with the woman of Samaria (John iv. 23); and now again, though less explicitly, at the close of it in the words we are considering. What part of the law of Moses—let the reader consider the question—could this people observe and practise, during those days of vengeance which were approaching, when their city should be subject to Gentile power and themselves scattered by the sword?

The Saviour, in view of these events, took occasion to embody in these two precepts all of the law which, from that time onward, would be useful to them. The typical parts of it he was himself about to fulfil. The spiritual parts of it only could they carry with them and observe and transmit to their children. These could be retained by them, and ought to be, under the most adverse and distressing circumstances. The gospel would indeed be preached to them,

enjoining repentance towards God, and faith in their rejected Messiah, without which they neither would nor could obey these precepts—the first of which was the measure of the allegiance they owe to God, and the second the measure of the duty he required of them towards their fellow-creatures. Taken in connexion with his answer to the Herodians (see vs. 21 and note) they form a compendious code of their civil or political, social and religious duties. Indeed the *first* precept in *this* answer is expository of the *second* precept in the answer to the Herodians. For when he said to them, Render to God the things that are God's, he imposed no other duty than that of fulfilling this first and great command. (See Mark xii. 32, 33, 34.)

Considered in this view there is great beauty in these answers of our blessed Lord to the ensnaring questions proposed to him as he was about to leave the temple. How suitable to the loftiness of his character! He speaks as a lawgiver, abrogating, in some sense, the former code (which was soon to become impracticable in many of its precepts)

David then call him"—Adoni, my "Lord"—not my son,—"how then is he"—the Christ—"his Son?"

These questions, we conceive, were suggested by the question of the lawyer which has just been considered, or rather by the answer which our Lord had given to it. He had just declared the duty they owed to God. The same duty, however, they owed to him as God's vicegerent on earth (John v. 21, 22, 23). Yet they had virtually rejected him, under a misapprehension of his nature and office. The second of these questions (founded upon the quotation from Ps. cx. 1), pointed them directly to the source of their error. As if he had said, "The Christ promised to you is a much more exalted being than you conceive him to be. Even David, in whom you glory, as the greatest of your kings, moved by inspiration, called him his (Adon) Lord. It is, then, only in some mysterious sense that David calls him his Son."

That the person whom David calls his (Adon) Lord is the Christ, is evident from the question. In fact the Saviour assumes it as unquestionable, and the Pharisees did not deny the assumption, and this proves that such was the commonly received interpretation. That the same person—this Lord (Adon) of David—is a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchizedec, is proved by the 4th verse of the (cxth) Psalm, from which this quotation is made. Now the office of priest belongs to the *human* nature. A priest must be a man, not an angel, not the Holy Spirit, nor the Son of God in his divine nature; for every high priest, saith the apostle, *is taken from among men*, &c., Heb. v. 1–6. (See Whitby's Com. on Heb. vii. 1; also 1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. xii. 24.) Of course, David had respect to the *human* nature of Christ, when he called him his (Adon) Lord. We may add that, in his human nature only, was the Messiah capable of exaltation. In his divine nature, he was God (John i. 1). The whole of this Psalm, in fact, is prophetical of the exaltation of Christ *as the Son of Man*, after his resurrection from the dead, and is so treated by the inspired apostles (Mark xvi. 19; Acts ii. 34–36; Eph. i. 20–22; Heb. ii. 7, 8, x. 12, 13, vi. 20; 1 Pet. iii. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 25; and see Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69). Finally the person represented as speaking throughout this Psalm is Jeho-

vah (see Heb. text)—the person represented as being spoken to, David calls his (Adon) Lord. They cannot, therefore, be one and the same person.

The Saviour's question then presents this difficulty: how the Messiah in his *human* nature can be the Lord of David from whom, according to the flesh, he was to descend. It is to be observed here, that the question is framed according to the conception which the Pharisees themselves entertained of the Christ. They regarded him merely as a man, like David, although a greater man, and a more successful and glorious king. Had they believed that the Son of God in his divine nature would become incarnate in the person of the Messiah, the question would have presented no difficulty except that which arises from the proper interpretation of the Psalm. They might have said, The Messiah will unite in his person the Divine and the human natures, and David recognised him as his superior in his divine nature and in his human nature, only in consequence of the honor conferred upon it by its union with the divine nature. This is the solution of

In reference to this relation, we conceive, the Lord Jesus proposed this question to the Pharisees, and the Psalm (cx.) justifies this interpretation: For the same exalted being whom David calls his Lord (Adoni) Jehovah constitutes a priest for ever (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, LXX.; Heb. v. 6), and exalts to his right hand. In this sublime relation, David in the Spirit beheld him, when he called him "Lord."

The reader is referred for a more full explanation of the grounds of this interpretation, to the notes on Matt. viii. 23–27, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32; ix. 4; xi. 25–27; xii. 8, 18; xiii. 37–43; xvi. 13, 14, 28; xvii. 22, 23; xx. 28, which it is hoped he will carefully consider, before he rejects it.

Matt. xxii. 46. "And no man"—no one of them—"was able to answer him a word"—no one of them could give the reason or explain why or in what sense David called the Christ his Lord.

They did not understand the mystery of the Messiah's nature either as the Son of Man or Son of God. It was as much hidden from the learned of the nation as it was from the common people (John xii. 34; see Rev. xxii. 16). His priesthood too, or the nature and grounds of it, and the sacrifice which it was appointed to him to make, were equally hidden from them. This is evident from the labored argument of the apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews, chap. v., vi., vii., viii. This priesthood we have endeavored to show was connected with his Adamic office as the Son of Man. The Saviour gave them no other clue to the question than that furnished by the Psalm from

---

by its ruler (Adon) or Lord. In this sense we apply the word to the Son of Man, as the (Adon) Lord and Judge and Ruler of the world. Such powers and prerogatives belong, by Divine constitution, to his Adamic character (Ps. viii 6; Heb. ii. 7, 8). The word is an appellative, and is used in Scripture as well with reference to God as to men. Thus, in Ps. viii. 1, Jehovah is addressed as (Adonenu) our Lord—our supporter. And such he is, in the highest possible sense. In one of our hymns we say: "God my supporter, (Adoni, my Adon) and my hope, my Help for ever nigh" Sarah called Abraham (Adoni) my Lord (Gen. xviii. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 6), in the sense of her inferiority to and dependence on him. (See various examples of the use of this word in Ps. xii. 4; Gen. xlv. 8; Exod. xxiii. 17; Ps. cxiv. 7; Is. i. 24; Mal. iii. 1; Josh. iii. 11; Ps. xcvii. 5; Gen. xxiii. 6, &c.) Some find the same figurative idea in the word *βασιλευς* (king) because a king is quasi *βάσιν τοῦ λεώ*. (See Gusetius Comm. Heb. Ling. and Forster's Heb. Lex.; also, Taylor's Heb. Concord).

which he made the quotation. It was not one of the things which it belonged to him, at that time, to explain: for the Psalm presupposed his rejection by them, as his enemies, and his exaltation, after his sacrificial work was performed, to the throne of Jehovah. It also presupposed his right, as their Lord, to the supreme homage of their natures—the same homage which he had just declared was due to God the Father (vs. 37). Herein lies the connexion between this question of the Saviour and the question of the lawyer. The lawyer had asked him, what is the chief duty of man—the great commandment of the law. The Saviour answered, "Supreme love to God, and the offering up to him and his service of all the energies of your natures." He then inquires, "But what think ye of the homage due to Christ?" David, the greatest of your kings, and honored above them all by the covenant God made with him (Ps. lxxxix. 35–37), called him his Lord, thus acknowledging his subjection to him, although he was not to be raised up from his seed till long after his death (Acts ii. 29–31). How then could David owe him homage, or render it to him? This was the first

which he himself had given, because that had been disregarded in the case of his servants. The event, it need not be added, falsified this expectation. The son found himself, at the very moment of his arrival, in the midst of enemies. To this circumstance of the parable, the Saviour, as we conceive, tacitly alludes in his quotation from the Psalm (cx. 1). For observe, the question he proposed to the Pharisees turned exclusively upon the *first* clause of the verse, "The Lord said unto my Lord." There was no occasion then to quote the clause which relates to the subjugation of Messiah's enemies, unless he intended a latent or indirect allusion to his actual posture at that time. Thus considered, this part of the quotation is full of meaning. Jerusalem, at that very time, was crowded with myriads of enemies who, on the third day thereafter, were to demand his crucifixion. Pilate and Herod and Roman soldiers were there. (See Acts iv. 27.) That very hour he had been insidiously attacked by the chief priests and elders, Herodians and Pharisees, with the design to ensnare him, and compass his death. We may add, the quotation was also a prediction of the result of the conflict, and, in this particular, it goes beyond the parable. It foretells his exaltation to Jehovah's throne, and the utter subjugation of all his enemies by Divine power, and the exaction of the homage due to him as the Lord of David and the Lord of the world.

Thus we perceive that these questions of our Lord spring from the same great vein of thought which pervades all his instructions in the temple upon that memorable day. Although drawn forth by disconnected and apparently irrelated questions, there is a logical connexion between his questions and his answers *to their* questions, eminently suited to the solemn occasion, and the Divine Majesty of the Saviour.

Matt. chap. xxiii. A leading object of these notes is to trace the connexion of the several parts of the evangelical record, and thus to illustrate obscure yet confessedly important passages, and also furnish distinct internal evidence of its truth. Of critical commentaries we have an abundance, but none written with a sole view to this object. The writer has not been able to accomplish much in this way, but what he has done may serve, to some extent, as

hints to others more competent to the undertaking, and more at leisure to accomplish it. In the note on Matt. i. 1, it was suggested, that this gospel was composed according to a pre-conceived plan which the author kept steadily in view, both in the selection and in the arrangement of the materials composing it. In the note on Matt. xiv. 1, 2, (Vol. xi. Journ. 388) this matter was adverted to again, and the reader was invited to review the proofs which had been given in support of the hypothesis. We now remark that whatever judgment different readers may form of the method of the evangelist, none, it is probable, will be disposed to deny that our Lord, in his discourses and conversations, pursued a chain of thought which, if the links of connexion could be discovered, would satisfactorily explain many expressions and transitions otherwise obscure, if not quite unaccountable. What the writer means by this remark will be understood by those readers who have carefully considered the notes on the 21st and 22d chapters. We have now come to one of the most obscure transitions

At first view it strikes us as an inconsistency that our Lord should at such a time, and under the circumstances mentioned, either admit the authority of the Scribes and Pharisees to occupy the seat of Moses, or enjoin it on the people or his disciples to obey their injunctions. What further need could there be for their instructions, seeing he was so soon to prepare and send to them other and inspired teachers, who would authoritatively and infallibly declare to them the Divine will? Our perplexity is increased when we consider the character which he proceeds almost immediately to draw of these teachers. (See vs. 13–36.)

To relieve the subject of this difficulty we must consider that our Lord had in view the course of Divine Providence, and the respite of judgment God would give the nation during (what we may consider) the life-time of that generation. In the remarks on Matt. xxii. 6, 8, and Acts iii. 19, 21 (Vol. x. pp. 569–573), it was intimated that a further trial was to be made of the nation, under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, for the space of nearly forty years, during which they should have an order of proofs which it was not consistent with the Divine plan to give them during our Lord's personal ministry. The first and greatest of these proofs was the Lord's resurrection, and to this he alluded under the sign of Jonas the prophet, in his answer to the demand the Pharisees and the Sadducees made upon him for further evidence. (See Matt. xvi. 4, and xii. 38–40, and notes on those verses; Luke xi. 30 is very explicit.) Of the fact of his resurrection they had the most convincing evidence. (See notes on Matt. xxviii. 11–15, Journ. Vol. x. 87–92.) This evidence was to be enhanced by the testimony and enforced by the miraculous powers and other extraordinary gifts conferred upon the apostles, who for a time confined their ministry to the nation. (See Acts, chap x., xi. 19, xiii. 46; see also Rom. ix. 4.) It is worthy of remark that the duration of this respite of judgment (upon the peradventure the nation might still believe and obey) was not chronologically defined.* God reserved it in his own power to put an end to it by his providence, as he did the times and

* Perhaps there is a mystical allusion to it in the forty days appointed for the repentance of Nineveh, as we shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

the seasons appointed to precede the restitution of the kingdom to Israel (Acts i. 6, 7). The end of the respite, we know, came when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed, and the nation was broken up and dispersed among the Gentiles. (See notes on the parable of the marriage, Matt. xxii. 6, 8, ante pp. 88, 89.) The sense of the verses under consideration, therefore, as we conceive of it, is expressed in the following paraphrase:

"The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat, and, by divine permission, they will continue to occupy it during the lifetime of the greater part of this generation. For it is the divine purpose, notwithstanding the enormous wickedness of this people, to put them upon a further trial, under the economy of the Holy Spirit, in order to prove whether by any means they can be saved from the dreadful judgments which have been threatened against them. As long, therefore, as God in his providence shall permit them to exercise the functions of their office, observe and do whatsoever they shall command you to do, in accordance with

authorized to carry out the divine plan in this particular (Acts xv. 23–29), and it is not improbable that it was on the authority of the very passage under consideration the apostles drew the distinction, before mentioned, between Jewish and Gentile converts.

But while the Saviour thus recognised the authority of the Scribes and Pharisees as teachers of the law (and as we may say, for a little space, prolonged their office, by his authority), he cautioned the people and his disciples against the evil influence of their example,—thus drawing a distinction between their personal and official character and relations. The Sadducees and the Herodians were worse—certainly not better men—than the Scribes and Pharisees, yet nothing is said of them in the ensuing discourse. The reason is, the latter were not looked upon by the people as teachers, or guides, or even as worthy of imitation in their conduct. The Scribes and Pharisees, on the other hand, rightfully occupied the seat of their great lawgiver, and the Lord himself had just given his own sanction to their public official relations. This last consideration especially, rendered the caution of the utmost practical importance, lest the command he had given his disciples and the people should be perverted. Add to this the exterior conduct of the Scribes and Pharisees, as we may infer from this chapter, was beautiful (vs. 27, 28) and imposing. Apparently they were men of prayer (vs. 14)—zealous in promoting religion (vs. 15)—punctilious in the performance of the smallest religious obligations (vs. 23). They not only acknowledged but seemingly deplored the sins of former generations (vs. 30), and were careful to do all they could [illegible] dishonor and the wrongs which had been [illegible]oly men and prophets of former ages (vs. [illegible] Saviour therefore given this command with[illegible], the spirit and intent of it might have been [illegible]ve been—misconceived, and the people [illegible]t have inferred his approbation of them [illegible]d conduct, as well as of their authority [illegible]gly, having given the command and [illegible]eeds afterwards to lay bare their real [illegible]t of God, in such a way as to prevent [illegible]sconceiving his meaning.

Verses 3 and 4. "But do ye not after their works, for they say and do not. For (indeed) they bind heavy burdens and grievous (difficult) to be borne, and they lay them upon the shoulders of men, while they will not move them with one of their fingers"—[will not put forth the strength of a finger to move them].

In these words our Lord alludes to their exposition of the precepts of Moses, as he does afterwards, in several instances, in his direct address to them (vs. 16–18), from which we infer he did not intend to enjoin implicit obedience to all their behests, or to hold them up as infallible interpreters of the law they had been commissioned to explain. The charge brought against them in this verse is an excess of power—an unauthorized imposition, to which they did not give even the sanction of their own example. Had they done so, it would have been in the nature of self-imposed penances, and could not have authorized them to impose them on others. The law, our Lord had himself on various occasions explained in several important particulars.

In these verses, our Lord describes the ruling passions of these teachers. They were ostentatious and vain-glorious. They loved and sought for distinction in social intercourse, in their religious assemblies, and in other public places, and everywhere to be recognised by all in their official relations. Had this been the worst that could be said of them they were unfit to be spiritual shepherds; and none who heard these words could fail to perceive how unworthy the Saviour deemed them of the distinctions they coveted.

Verse 8. "But be not ye called Rabbi"—my master—"for one is your master"—the master of you all—"Christ."

It should be remembered that our Lord did not, during his personal ministry, publicly assume or take to himself the title of Christ. This is evident from the fact that when arraigned before the High Priest, he was questioned under a solemn adjuration whether he was the Christ or not (Matt. xxvi. 63; Mark xiv. 61; Luke xxii. 67; see John x. 24). So far from assuming the title, he solemnly charged his disciples to tell no man that he was the Christ (Matt. xvi. 20; see note on that verse and on Matt. xi. 3). Nor did he assume it on this occasion. But what he said amounted to the assertion that Moses (in whose seat the Scribes and Pharisees sat) was no longer their master, nor they his disciples. Consequently, a new order of things had commenced, under one greater than Moses (Acts iii. 22; Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19), whom they were bound to obey; and this, notwithstanding the permitted continuance of the Levitical ritual, and the qualified command he had just given them to obey (so long as Providence should permit) the precepts of those who sat in Moses' seat. The command he had given was indeed an assertion of authority which none but the Christ could exercise. It was, in fact, an extension of the Levitical ritual; and of the authority of those to whom the administration of it had been committed. In this view the mere assumption of such authority (which none but the Christ could exercise) was virtually an assumption of the character of Christ. Still, our Lord employs the title without any direct or explicit application of it to himself, and it is evident that the chief priests and the rulers (who doubtless were informed of all that transpired on this occasion), did not regard it such an assumption of

the office as would be a sufficient foundation for a public accusation. (See Luke xxii. 67; Mark xiv. 61; Matt. xxvi. 63.)

Verse 8–11. "And all ye are brethren. And call no man father, for one is your Father which is in heaven (εν τοις ουρανοις, omnipresent). Neither be ye called masters; for one is your master, Christ; and he that is greatest (literally, and the greatest of you) shall be your servant."

Our Lord had before declared this law of his kingdom in a private conversation with the twelve apostles. (See Matt. xx. 24–27; see notes ante pp. 41, 42.) Now he publicly declares it in the temple to the people and all his disciples. As a rule of conduct it was the reverse of their preconceived opinions of honor and greatness, as well as of the teachings and example of the Scribes and Pharisees. But the point most important to be noticed in this connexion, is the bearing it has upon the undefined period of respite or grace which was still allotted to the nation. Although their worship and their ceremonial worship would be permitted for a time, and until God, in his providence, should

before God. Sin has wrought the distinctions which hitherto men have established among themselves. Henceforth Christ is your only Monarch, and God the Father of All is your Father. In the kingdom of God the present order of things will be reversed. Your greatest honor and glory will be to serve each other."

When we consider the occasion upon which these precepts were given, and the tone of authority with which they were pronounced, we cannot doubt that the Saviour intended to abrogate all existing and hitherto allowed usages under the Levitical economy inconsistent with the kingdom he came to establish. The social state which would be produced by universal and perfect obedience to these precepts, will, we doubt not, be realized when Israel shall be restored to their land and to the favor of God, and the new covenant written in their hearts according to the prediction (Jeremiah xxxi. 31–34; Heb. viii. 8–11).

That they were not observed by the nation at that time, nor have been in any of the ages since, is not an objection to this view of the passage. Our Lord foresaw that until the Spirit should be poured from on high his will would be disregarded not only by avowed enemies but by many who professed to be his disciples and followers. It was none the less proper however (see Matt. v. 48) for him to proclaim the law of his kingdom, and to annex to it the sanction in the following verse:

Matt. xxiii. 12. "And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased, and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted."

We do not regard these words as merely predictive (as we may in Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14) but as the expression of the Saviour's will or purpose. They are words of legislation, and strictly and properly a legislative sanction in the technical sense. It has been observed that "human legislators have for the most part chosen to make the sanction of their laws rather *vindicatory* than *remuneratory* or to consist rather in punishments than in actual particular rewards." This sanction comprises both these qualities. It is aimed directly at the root of the evil—a remarkable characteristic, which can seldom be attained in human legislation owing to the imperfection of the executive or administrative

power of the state. Observe, obedience to these precepts is the appointed way to secure the very end which the disobedience of them aims to attain. Self-exaltation is a breach of this fundamental law of the kingdom. Its appointed punishment is degradation and abasement by the power of Christ the King. Self-humiliation is the indispensable qualification for the service of Christ. It is a grace which God alone can give, and the greater the humiliation the greater the gift of grace, and the greater the qualification for exalted service. To the carnal mind such a law is a paradox, being founded upon conditions repugnant to the innate principles of human nature as it now is, and therefore impossible to unrenewed men. Indeed it is one of the mysteries of the kingdom of God.

It has been remarked that these precepts (abating the penal portion of the sanction) are substantially the same, as our Lord gave to the twelve apostles on a former occasion. (See Matt. xx. 25–27 and notes.) It should now be added, that the addition of the sanction is to be accounted for by the difference of the application. It is, indeed, the *same* law

mandments of the law, which he had just before declared in answer to the question of the lawyer. (See Matt. xxii. 37, 40, and notes.)

We may discern here another link in the chain of thought, which pervades the whole of this last public discourse of our Lord. In commenting upon his question to the Pharisees, concerning the Christ (Matt. xxii. 41–45), it was suggested that he claimed for himself the same love, honor, and obedience as are due to God the Father. In these verses he explicitly declares that while God the Father is father of all, Christ (the Son of Man) is the Master or Monarch of all. (See notes on Matt. ix. 6, and xii. 8.) He assumes authority over the laws and institutions established by the hand of Moses; and as the only lawgiver and mediator between God and men, on the one hand continues by his own authority, for the time being, the ceremonial parts of their worship; and on the other promulgates new precepts designed to effect an entire change of their exterior life, and bring it into conformity with the two great commandments of the law affecting their inner life. Taken together, they form the code of the laws of the kingdom of God, distinguished from all human codes alike by its brevity and perfectness. It is the outward realization of these laws, through the hearty and perfect obedience of all, which the Saviour taught us to pray for in the prayer he indited for the apostles —"Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"—and it is from their actual realization we can most easily form an idea of the social state of men on earth, when that kingdom shall be outwardly established under the reign of Christ, the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. PHILO.

ART. III.—THE JUDGMENTS FORESHOWN UNDER THE VIALS.

REVELATION, CHAPTER XV. AND XVI.

THE great evils with which the nations of Europe have recently been scourging each other are undoubtedly among those foreshown under the vials of the wrath of God (Rev. xv.

and xvi), and have an important place in the series of judgments which is ere long to terminate in the destruction of the anti-christian powers. The peculiarities of the vision in which they were revealed to the apostle, and the characteristics that distinguish them from other calamities foretold in the prophecy, indicate that they are events of extraordinary significance in God's sway over the nations.

1. The hosts of the redeemed who were to suffer persecution from the powers denoted by the wild-beast and its image, during the period of their triumphant career, were present in the vision, and attested the truth and righteousness of God in the judgments that are foreshown in it.

"And I saw another sign in heaven, great and wonderful; seven angels having the last seven plagues; for in them the wrath of God is finished.

"And I saw as it were a glassy sea mingled with fire: and they who are victors from the wild beast, and from its image, and from the number of its name, standing on the glassy sea, having harps of God; and they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying:

against their seductive arts and cruel inflictions, maintained allegiance to God. And they sing the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb; ascribing to God the judgments about to be symbolized as though already accomplished, and chanting them as displaying and vindicating his perfections, and entitling him to the awe and homage of all his creatures. And this is a peculiarity of this vision. For though the living creatures and elders, who were representatives of the redeemed, were present in probably all the visions, and the spirits of some of the martyrs addressed God under the fifth seal, this is the only occasion in which the redeemed, as a body, who were to suffer persecution, appeared in the divine presence to witness the symbolization of his judgments on their persecutors, and testify their sense of its suitableness to his holiness and justice; and it is the means of disclosures to us of the greatest significance.

For, in the first place, it shows that the redeemed in heaven are acquainted with the great purpose God has formed and revealed in respect to the conflict between his children and their enemies here, down to the time of Christ's second coming. The revelation, indeed, made in the visions, was made, we are shown, at almost every stage of the symbolizations, in the presence of the living creatures and elders, who were representatives of the redeemed generally who were then in heaven (chap. v. 9); but this indicates directly that it was to be communicated to all who entered heaven in the ages that followed, down to the time of the judgments foreshown under the vials. For though none but those who had maintained a conflict with the beast and its image stood on the expanse before the throne, to celebrate the holiness and justice of the Most High, we are not thence to suppose that the knowledge of the judgments he was about to inflict is confined to them. It is undoubtedly common to all the ransomed who have passed to the skies.

In the next place, it indicates that they have such a knowledge of God and his kingdom, on the one hand, and of the guilt of the corrupters of men and the persecutors of his people on the other, as to see and feel, with the deepest conviction, the propriety of his vindicating his rights and displaying his justice in punishing those enemies of his kingdom. They sing, "Great and wonderful are thy works,

Lord God Almighty, just and true are thy ways, King of the nations!"

And, in the third place, they are aware that these judgments, by which his great and implacable enemies are to be scourged, are to issue in the conversion of the nations and the redemption of the world. "Who shall not fear thee and glorify thy name as alone holy? For all nations shall come and worship before thee, because thy judgments have been made manifest!"

A flood of light is thus thrown by this revelation on their life in the heavenly world. Instead of sinking, as some imagine, into insensibility, they exist in consciousness and activity. In place of being consigned, as others hold, to some remote and shadowy realm, where they wear away their intermediate existence, in utter ignorance of what is passing in heaven and on the earth, they are raised to the most intimate relations to God, are made aware of his great purposes towards his kingdom here, are witnesses, as it were, of all the great acts of his providence towards his people and his enemies, and know to what point he has advanced in

his judgments, this joy at the approach of his kingdom—presents to the ignorance, the indifference, the unbelief, the false notions, the mere political views and sentiments with which the world and church generally contemplate the great events God has thus foreshown, as inflictions of his wrath on the nations that are arrayed against his kingdom. Yet they cannot be contemplated by us aright, unless we view them as they are viewed in heaven. They will not be regarded here with proper sentiments till they are beheld with the faith, the adoring submission, the awe, and the joy in God with which they inspire the spirits of the just made perfect, who behold them in the light of God's immediate presence.

2. The judgments themselves, also foreshown under the vials, are distinguished by several peculiarities.

First. They are, with the exception of the last, inflicted exclusively on those who have the mark of the beast, and who worship its image; that is, on the submissive subjects of the civil powers of the ten kingdoms, who usurp authority over religion and nationalize the church, and on the obedient vassals of the Catholic hierarchies of those kingdoms that have the pope as their head. The judgments symbolized under the trumpets were inflicted on the eastern Roman empire as well as the west; and on pagans as well as on those who professed the name of Christ.

Second. The judgments foreshown under the trumpets, were inflicted on the population of the Roman empire, east and west, by foreign and barbarous nations, such as the Goths and Vandals, who conquered Germany, France, Spain, Numidia, and Italy: and the Saracens, Moguls, and Ottomans, who took possession of the east, and of Greece, the provinces on the Danube, northern Africa, and part of Spain. The judgments symbolized under the first six vials, are inflicted on the population of the ten kingdoms by themselves.

Third. The inflictions symbolized under the vials, are to be the last plagues with which the nations that have apostatized from the gospel are to be smitten, and are to continue but a short period; as they take place towards the close of the wild beast's career, and are to issue in its destruction. Instead of such brevity, some of the judg-

ments foreshown under the trumpets, especially the sixth, have already continued through a long series of ages.

As the great actors and sufferers under the vials are the instruments of divine vengeance on one another, the passions they exhibit are of an awful character, and indicate that they have sunk to a dreadful depth of impiety towards God, and malignity towards each other.

Thus, the event foreshown under the first vial is the corroding disquiet, the burning torture felt by individuals under a sense of the debasing deceptions, the cruel deprivations, and the crushing tyrannies they suffer from their civil and ecclesiastical rulers. "And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go ye and pour the seven vials of the wrath of God on the earth. And the first went and poured his vial on the land; and an evil and noxious ulcer came on the men who have the mark of the wild beast, and who worship its image." (Chap. xvi. 1, 2.)

The land is the symbol of a people in subjection to an

in turn inflamed with resentment, tortured with fear, and overwhelmed with chagrin and despair. They thus became impassioned and implacable enemies of each other. The people felt that the rulers and priests, to whom they had yielded an implicit submission, instead of consulting their wellbeing, had used their power to crush them to an insupportable slavery, and sink them to a senseless and impious superstition; and the rulers and priests saw that the means by which they had long made the crowd the instruments of their ambition, had at length goaded them to resistance, and were likely to drive them into lasting revolt. And the same disquiets, agitations, and terror soon rose in the neighboring kingdoms. The whole of western Europe was thus shaken with commotion and alarm. In France, especially, the centre of the Catholic world, and in a measure in Switzerland, Italy, Germany, and at length Spain and Portugal, nearly the whole population was arrayed against the monarchs, the nobility, and the church. There was not a subject but writhed beneath the lash of tyranny with which he was perpetually goaded; not a monarch but felt his throne crumbling beneath him; not a prince or prelate but trembled at signals that his power was vanishing from his hands.

Under the second vial the people gave vent to their passions in attempts to exterminate their civil and ecclesiastical rulers, denoted by the wild beast and its image. "And the second poured his vial on the sea, and it became blood as of one dead. And every creature of life in the sea died" (vs. 3).

The sea is the symbol of a people in a state of commotion and revolution. Its conversion into blood, as of one dead, so as to be unsuited to sustain the life of the animals subsisting in it, represents an analogous change in the nation whom it denotes, by which it becomes destructive to those who subsist in it; such as the rulers, priests, nobles, and the wealthy, who owe to it their peculiar station, their power, and their property. And this had its accomplishment in the social disorganization of the second stage of the French Revolution, when the supreme power passing from the monarch to the Constituent Assembly and the rabble, an attempt was made to exterminate those of rank as enemies of liberty; and the king and his family, and a vast crowd of nobles,

priests, and others of distinction, were swept to the grave. They thus became the instruments of divine justice on one another, and displayed towards each other the mercilessness and ferocity of brutes and demons rather than men. Such a conversion of a government into a mere engine of vengeance, such wanton and wholesale slaughters, such infuriate and remorseless cruelties, the world had never seen before.

The cruel passions with which the French had thus avenged themselves on one another, they, under the third vial, turned and wreaked with equal ferocity on the nations around them. "And the third poured his vial on the rivers and the fountains of the waters, and they became blood. And I heard the angel of the waters saying, Righteous art thou who art and who wast holy, because thou hast judged thus; for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink. They are worthy. And I heard the altar say, Yea, O Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments" (vs. 4–7).

The rivers and the fountains of the waters are symbols of

eously and wisely appointed by the Most High in retribution of their mercilessness and malice in shedding the blood of the saints and prophets whom God had, from age to age, raised up to proclaim among them his truth. Righteous especially is he who is ever holy in thus dooming these nations. It behoves him to leave them to be the instruments of his vengeance on each other, that they may themselves, in the presence of the universe, confute the pretence that they are his vicegerents and his children; and may show how cruel and fiendish the passions are with which they are animated. In thus wantonly and malignantly dashing each other to death, they act out themselves, they show that they are as cruel and remorseless towards one another as they were towards the saints and prophets whom they slaughtered; and they thereby vindicate God in their destruction. A voice also from the altar—on which justice was appeased—declared that these judgments were manifestive of the truth and righteousness of God. In them the nations show themselves to be what he represents them, and make it manifest that the evils they inflict on each other are such as their crimes in slaughtering his holy ones deserve.

The next vial indicates the oppressions that followed as a consequence of these revolutions and wars. "And the fourth poured his vial on the sun. And it was given to it to scorch the men with fire. And the men were scorched with great heat. And they blasphemed the name of God, who has power over these plagues; and they repented not to give him glory," vs. 8, 9. The sun is the symbol of the supreme rulers of the nations; the office it fills to the earth in giving light and warmth, and ministering to the life of vegetables and animals, being analogous to that which just, wise, and good rulers fill towards their subjects in securing their safety, aiding them in their useful pursuits, and promoting their happiness. Raising the rays of the sun to a scorching heat, accordingly symbolized a resembling change in the governments of the nations, by which they became torturing and insupportable from their tyrannies and oppressions. And this was verified in the exorbitant exactions and crushing despotisms that resulted from the judgments foreshown under the preceding vials. The nations, especially

of the continent, instead of the large liberty and greater ease of life which they had anticipated from their revolutions and wars, found themselves burthened with a still severer taxation, and bound in the chains of a more arbitrary tyranny. The fruit they had so eagerly sought and plucked, turned, as it touched their lips, to ashes; yet, instead of discerning the folly and madness of their schemes of happiness and glory, and recognising the justice of God in their sufferings, they justified themselves, and impeached his power, his justice, and his goodness. Not a whisper of repentance has been heard from any of the nations because of the crimes which have drawn on them these terrible judgments. Instead, they exult in their persecution of God's people; they boast of their revolts against their rulers, and the revolutions they have wrought in their governments; they glory in the carnage of their battlefields, and thus show that the terrible miseries with which they have overwhelmed themselves, have contributed nothing to recall them to allegiance to God.

from their monarchs the arbitrary power to which they had risen, and institute representative governments; in which, however, after a period of seeming success, they were baffled, and sank back to as abject and hopeless a vassalage as before, and to a still deeper sense of the strength of the chains with which they are bound, and the weight of the oppressions with which they are crushed; and, as under the fourth vial, instead of acknowledging these calamities as righteous punishments of their sins, they denounce them as unjust, and impeach the God of heaven for permitting them.

The next is poured on men—in their relations to the nationalized church, instead of the civil rulers. "And the sixth poured his vial on the great river, the Euphrates. And its water was dried up, that the way might be prepared of the kings from the sunrising," vs. 12. The Euphrates is the river which Cyrus and Darius the kings of the east diverted from its channel in order to the conquest of Babylon. That which the river here denotes, bears an analogous relation to the Babylon of the prophecy, and its drying up is to be in order to the overthrow of that apostate power. The persons denoted by the kings of the east are those who are to project and accomplish its conquest. But as waters are symbols of people under the second and third vials and in other passages, as chap. xvii. 15, and as the Euphrates ran through the ancient Babylon, the river in this vision denotes the population of the kingdoms that sustain a resembling relation to the hierarchy of the church of which Babylon is the symbol, and which is mainly, perhaps exclusively, the nationalized Roman Catholic Church, as is shown by its other symbol, a profligate woman borne by the wild beast, chap. xvii. 3–5. The drying up of the river, in order to prepare the way of the kings of the east, denotes the alienation of the people of the kingdoms from that hierarchy, and is to be in order to its dejection from its station as nationalized. This also has been largely accomplished in all the Catholic nations, is still in progress, and may yet, perhaps, assume far more conspicuous and emphatic forms. And as the excavations by which the literal river was turned from its channel, were the work of the enemies who thereby conquered Babylon, so this alienation of the multitudes

who were once her vassals, from the hierarchy of the Catholic church, is the work of the enemies of that corrupt and malign power. The prophet proceeds:

"And I saw three unclean spirits as frogs proceed out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the wild beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet; for they are spirits of demons working wonders, which go to the kings of the whole [Roman] world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God the Almighty," verses 13, 14. As no such emissaries have yet appeared to gather the kings to a direct contest with Christ, or attempt to prevent his establishing his throne on the earth, their emission is undoubtedly yet future. And as it is from the mouth of the false prophet—or pope—that one of the demon spirits proceeds—not of the woman Babylon, the living symbol of the nationalized Catholic hierarchy, it is probable that the emission is not to take place till after the fall of Babylon from her nationalization, and is to be a consequence of that. It is shown moreover by the warning that follows that at

exception of the second, are still pouring. The vast and exact correspondence of the events of the French Revolution, and the wars, oppressions, revolutions, and alienations of the people from the church, that have followed in its train and are still following, with the symbols of the vials, leave no room to doubt that they are the plagues which they foreshow.

It is one of their distinguishing peculiarities that they are intimately connected, and sprang from each other as natural consequences. The events symbolized under the seals and trumpets were very diverse in their nature, and had little natural connexion with each other. The spread of the gospel, foreshown under the first seal, was not the natural cause of the religious ambitions and contentions represented under the second; nor were they the natural cause of the false teachings and superstitious practices symbolized under the third; neither were these the necessary cause of the cruel tyrannies and bloody persecutions revealed under the fourth. The irruptions of the Goths into the western empire, foreshown under the first, second, and third trumpets, were not the cause of the invasions of the eastern by the Saracens, revealed under the fifth, nor by the Moguls and Ottomans, predicted under the sixth. But the new and torturing opinions symbolized under the first vial, were the direct and natural causes of the exterminating war on the monarch, princes, nobles, and priests signified under the second; and that war and the passage of the supreme power from the monarchy to the people, were direct causes of the wars of the French with the neighboring nations, for the twenty years that followed, represented under the third; and those wars were the cause of the oppressions and tyrannies symbolized under the fourth; and it was that combination of causes that led again to the attempt of the nations in 1848, to wrench the power from their oppressors, and institute representative governments in their place, foreshown under the fifth: and all this train of opinions, agitations, and catastrophes had a share in alienating the people of France, Italy, Spain, Germany, and other Catholic countries, from the papacy, and inspiring them with a wish to disburthen themselves of that odious power. They thus form a closely connected group that naturally sprang out of the false prin-

ciples, bad passions, and miseries of the people on the one hand, and the exorbitant usurpations, the cruel tyrannies, and the debasing impositions of the rulers and priests on the other.

But a feature of this great tragedy of folly, rage, and blood that should more especially engage our notice and impress us with awe, is, the prophecy indicates, that it is permitted of God in order that heaven and earth may see that these great enemies of his kingdom are what he represents them to be—monsters of malignity towards him and towards one another, and that it may be felt by all that he is just in adjudging them to the eternal death to which he is to consign them. The plagues with which they are smitten are indeed punishments of their crimes against him, but they are left to be the instruments of the infliction, and it is allowed to take these shapes, the angel of the waters and the voice from the altar declare, in order that he may be seen to be truthful and just in his judgments on them. He denounces the beast and false prophet as usurpers of his

what spectacle did the world ever witness that transcended that which each has exhibited;—the rulers and priests, on the one side—of injustice and malice towards the multitudes over whose temporal and eternal interests they claim dominion; divesting them of their rights, crushing them with oppression, and dashing them by millions to the grave, to gratify their pride, their ambition, and their malice;—and the people on the other, in heaping contempt, hatred, and violence, in their most ignominious forms, and inflicting death on the monarchs, nobles, and priests, to whom they have, in effect, ascribed the prerogatives of God, and paid a homage that is due only to him! Can any other confutation of themselves be conceived that equals it? Can any proof be imagined more decisive and awful than they exhibit in their treachery, their rage, their ruthless cruelty, their insatiable thirst of blood, that they are as deadly enemies of each other as they are of God—that their hearts are as malignant as their religion is false? With what emotions must the scene be beheld by the heavenly hosts! How profound must be their feeling of the wisdom of God, in thus allowing them to be the instruments of their punishment, and to show by their malice towards one another how false and impious their pretexts are of authority and power to save, and how just and holy he is in removing them from the world in order to the establishment of his kingdom!

Art. IV.—The Deluge a Cause of Geological Change.

BY THE REV. D. C. M'LAREN, D.D., GENEVA.

The account, given in the sacred volume, of the creation of the earth and of its subsequent diluvial devastation, irrespective of its divine authenticity, may justly claim from literature a close examination of its import, and from science a recognition of its truth to the full extent of its agreement with the known realities of existing nature. It matters not who wrote it or by what impulse he was moved. That old narrative has intrinsic merit. It is in matter and

style historic. It is genuine natural history, the most ancient extant, handed down from an early age which no other history reaches, and open to the searching scrutiny of the most learned among nations, the most learned in every age since. It treats, and that too professedly, of momentous events and changes, which took place in the constitution and domains of nature long before the rise of any natural science that now enlightens the world. If this part were severed from the rest of the Bible, if it were made up of a few pages left of a book lost, it would be entitled to the profound regard of those who study the phenomena of nature, and pry into the mysteries that lie beneath them.

This venerable record, in unfolding the origin and original condition of the earth, furnishes material for the following propositions, which the facts of nature, ascertained and attested by geology, demonstrate, as there was an attempt to show in a former paper, in support of the common interpretation of this part of Genesis.

1. That every species of vegetable and of animal, that ever was or now is on the earth, was, in its first being, cre-

must have been rich soil to sustain the vast luxuriant vegetation of which the coal-fields bear witness. The action of water and law of gravity may account for the stratification of rocks, but not for the formation of the diverse kinds of matter of which they are composed. If they were all now crushed into particles, and these, with all else of an earthy kind on the face of the earth, mixed up in the proportions most conducive to a good soil, the compound mass spread out over the fundamental granite would approximate in depth and quality to the soil that covered it when the dry land first appeared.

3. That land and water, the two great divisions of the globe, with all essentially pertaining to each, were created simultaneously. Geology cannot in its retrospect discover that the one existed before the other.

4. That the new-made earth, as a whole, with all its organized and living fulness, was distinguished in its every department for its physical excellence, being, in its first estate, the seat and scene of universal beauty, grandeur, and fertility. "And God saw everything that he had made," including in that omniscient survey, atmosphere, water, electricity, sunshine, ground, minerals, and all plants and animals of every size and shape, "and, behold, everything was very good," superlatively good after its kind, in its nature and relations. This crown, wrought out by creative power from uncreated riches, terrestrial nature wore, till it was taken off and broken by the almighty hand that made it. Its precious fragments, its magnificent remains are to be found where the hand that shattered it to pieces, scattered them. These are the pride, the treasures, and wonders of geology. They are impressive and significant memorials of the past, and betoken a period of natural prosperity, and the universal prevalence of a physical perfection on the earth, which ended in a catastrophe. If those creatures of God, as science acknowledges them to be, are so wonderful in their broken, disjoined, and time-worn remains, after death and corruption have wasted them, how surpassingly wonderful must they have been in their native maturity, and in the living display of their capacities and powers. From the crumbling, outspread remains of a temple, from fragments of its columns, corner-stones, and sculptures, an observer

may form some judgment of what the temple itself was, when it was new in its structure and decorations, standing in its strength and glory unmarred. From what is manifest in the sedimentary bed that now coats the earth, we may draw an inference that will coincide with the inspired record, in respect to the state of the habitable world before that bed of sediment was deposited, when the earthy matter of which it is made up was the dry land, and when all trees, shrubs, beasts, birds, fishes, reptiles, and insects whose remains it contains, were alive and thriving, each in the circumstances and element suited to its nature. If the sedimentary rocks, the settlings of the ocean that once covered the present dry land, were entirely devoid of organic remains, the absence of such remains would furnish an argument which infidelity would be very ready to use in its warfare against the Bible. For it might then argue that, if such a world as the Bible represents, had been created in a finished state, furnished even to fulness with the fabrics of a recent creation, and afterwards been destroyed by an overwhelming ocean, some remains of them would have been submerged in the deep sediment left on the face of the earth by that ocean on its subsidence. Seeing, therefore, that there are remains of creatures that never had fellowship with the surface of the earth as it now is, have we not the charter of reason, as well as of heaven, to run an argument in an opposite direction for the furtherance of truth, when we can run it on the straight and safe track of facts as manifest and immovable as the rocks beneath our feet? The ruins of Herculaneum are a proof of the truth of every ancient mention made of the prosperity of that city, and of its final destruction and burial beneath an accumulation of volcanic ashes. A comparatively small portion of the buried ruins of Nineveh confirms the truth of ancient history in regard to the antiquity, monuments, and power of "that great city." So also are organic remains the confirmatory seal of nature to the truth of the Hebrew history of the rise, magnificence, and overthrow of "the old world."

The primeval earth continued as it was on its first Sabbath for ages afterwards. There is no intimation in this record of those early times, that any disastrous change, bo-

tanic, zoological, or geologic, immediately followed the entrance of sin into that splendid world. The curse pronounced after the fall of man, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake," took effect on Adam in his relations to the earth. All around him was still in itself good. It was, however, no longer as it had been, good to him. In the loss of communion with God, in the decay of integrity in his soul, under the influence of sin, he lost all right to, and capacity for, that measure of happiness of which created things are the means and medium. Blessings in the richest profusion abounded on every side. To him they were not blessings. In the midst of them all he was afraid, ashamed, and unhappy. "In sorrow shalt thou eat bread all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall the ground bring forth unto thee." In the field of his toil he was liable to damage and disappointment.

The ground, being "very good," included every variety of soil, every variety having in it the ingredients and properties of a perfect soil, with warmth and moisture everywhere sufficient to render it productive; and the physical causes, tributary to a rapid, rank, and nutritious vegetation, were universal, abundant, and everywhere operative. There was nothing in "the dry land," then, defective, redundant, or disproportioned—no sandy deserts, sterile claybeds, rocky barrens, chalk-hills, swamps, or such like. All the land was good land, and the trees, vines, and herbs which it nourished, were all very good, excelling, as we suppose, in beauty of flower and foliage, in delicacy of structure, in singularity of form, and in richness of fruit, any now to be seen in any part of the earth.

It does not appear that on the fall of man by transgression, any physical change in the dry land at once ensued. The soil was not deprived of its native fertility, nor the vegetation which it sustained, of its luxuriance and splendor. The trees in the garden of Eden were still "pleasant to the eye and good for food." Only man was debarred from its fruits and fountains.

But whatever deterioration, in virtue of the curse, may have been diffused through the soil to mar its pristine properties, or weaken its vegetative power, and altered as the earth may thus have become from what it was at first in

point of perfection, it was still capable of sustaining all the living creatures which God had made, with their natural increase, and of sustaining them, till their natural decline, in a plenitude and vigor of life far surpassing what is now attained.

Man was obnoxious to death. The shadow of death was upon him from the day on which he sinned. His physical constitution may have sympathized in the decline of his moral. But, what must have been the powers of life in the human frame, what robust soundness in the bodily organs, what healthful regularity in their functions, and how conducive to the prolongation of life in man must have been the air he breathed, the water he drank, the food he ate, all the influences of nature around him, when his ordinary age extended to hundreds of years. May we not, from this well-known and well-attested fact, in regard to the human race, infer with assurance of its truth, that in that remarkable period of salubrity and exuberant fertility, the true Palæozoic Period, the whole world, land, water, and air, were filled with living creatures of all forms and sizes

tion, and must have a place in a true and full history of the human race. Its sway extended to all other terrestrial beings. Its movements swept over a whole full world of organized and living creatures, and it is worthy of scientific acknowledgment that its overwhelming influence preceded the entrance of natural science into the department with which it is conversant. But to come at once to the point at which we aim; we affirm, that the Deluge affected the exterior surface of the material earth itself, as well as its fulness, changing it from what it had been from the beginning up to that time, to what it has been naturally ever since, and will be to the end. It was not a deluge over the earth, as the earth now is, covered and incrusted with the sediment of a deluge, but as the earth was by creation, before the windows of heaven were opened. The cause of that change is diluvial. The change itself, or its abiding effects, now a fixed part of nature, are geological. This position, with the inspired record in our hands, we feel not only warranted but obligated to take. That record is testimony, the meaning of which, shining forth, is the best light for seeing the directness of its bearings on geology, and also for reading without injury to the eyes, the voluminous certifications of its truth, legible and preserved in the rocks. Look into the old testimony, study it. What is the sum of the information it has been offering to the inquiries of the human mind, concerning the deluge, for many ages, and long before the science of geology began its great work? We observe, according to our understanding of the Bible,

1. That the deluge was a supernatural event, inasmuch as it was caused, controlled, and terminated by Divine agency, acting out of the ordinary course of nature, through second causes which its own power magnified in measure and intensity of force, and thus into a capacity for the production of effects for which, under the ordinary laws of nature, they were insufficient. "And I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth." That immense inundation proceeded from the omnipotence of God. He directed, supplied, and intensified all tributary and subordinate causes, to the fulfilment of his will. The windows of heaven and the fountains of the deep opened at his bidding. It is difficult for the mind to form a definite general idea of such

a flood. Who can go into details? Who, amid all the geologic facilities enjoyed on this earth for judging of inundations, is competent to describe the workings of a universal flood, the motion of its waters, or the order and arrangement in which it would deposit at its bottom the dirt and dead things under its sway, or to decide that it would or would not, on its cessation, leave behind it a sediment in all respects like and equal to present sedimentary rocks? There is no standard or analogy to direct and aid the understanding in exploring that unfathomable deep, and the imagination, self-conceited, giddy, and reckless as it is when it gets away from the understanding, is worse than no guide at all.

The deluge, at its close, would leave on the dry land many marks which were long since obliterated; but while they remained they would be evidence of the fact that they were made by the action of a flood, although in some cases it might be impossible to ascertain what that action was, or how the waters made them. So with those works or effects of the flood that are permanent. They must indicate, with

earth, from the mountain tops to the fundamental granite. It is reasonable, with respect to the *diluvial* parts of the earth, as with respect to the rest of it, and the creatures shadowed forth in fossils, if natural causes could not produce them, to look above nature to Him of whom the Scripture saith, with an illustration in the deluge, "He hath his way in the sea, and his path in the mighty waters, and his footsteps are not known."

Some one may ask, How can this or that fact be accounted for by the workings of a deluge of only a few months' continuance? We answer, 1st. Be sure that it is a fact as you state it—a fact taken from nature and not from a geological painting which may be a fancy sketch, or, if copied from nature, highly colored by the fine art of assumption. For example, How could the hard stones and gravel, found in hills and plains in positions where no present ocean or lake could touch them, be rubbed and worn into the size and shape they have in a few months by the waters of a deluge? It would be impossible. Stop a little. Are you sure they were as hard as they now are, when they were subject to the attrition of which they bear evidence, and were fragments just loosened from strata recently formed and but partially hardened, all still under water? As for granite boulders, they are hard enough now from hard usage in their exile and exposure for centuries. But were they as hard when first torn from their beds in their mountain home? Take away the assumption, altogether arbitrary, that the rocks were as hard and unyielding as they are now when their face was scratched and grooved, as it is found on exposure to be, wherever it has been since protected from the wear of external agencies, and then, there will be no further necessity or use, in an important natural science, for monstrous creeping glaciers, floating islands of ice, and a polar climate, though without a frozen sea, for myriads of years in the temperate zone.

2nd. It is easy work to ask questions. Folly may ask what wisdom cannot answer. But an unanswerable question is one thing and an unanswerable objection quite another.

3d. We do not undertake to lay open every or any mystery there is in the diluvial part of nature. For, on the one hand, although the general mystery, as to adequate causa-

tion, is revealed in the scriptural account of the deluge, we do not know the various processes and movements by which the magnified natural causes, then called into activity, produced the various effects which they left on the face of the earth. Such knowledge is too wonderful for us. It is deeper and broader than the sea. We have not eyes, and God has not given us light, to see into and throughout that profound ocean that covered mountains—that we should be able to tell what took place here and there and everywhere beneath its surface. On the otherh and, we cannot explain, if we would, what is really mysterious in diluvial phenomena by calling in the aid of any second causes now operative in the course and kingdom of nature; that is, we cannot explain it away. This is the very thing which we are endeavoring to prove the intellect and learning of the world cannot do. All effects that are diluvial, whether in themselves, their position, or their relations, have on them or around them the marks of secondary causes, but also the mark of the First Cause, Jehovah, who gave those natural causes a superna-

ark and of their countless descendants in successive generations ever since. Next in greatness to the creation of the world is its renewal—the mighty work of remodelling and refitting its outer surface even when flooded with waters, and of arranging, in the very process of deposition, its mineral and vegetable deposits, as it were, in safe storehouses, for the use and convenience of the human family. In this aspect of the deluge there are such showings forth of God, of his wisdom, power, and goodness in the great work of making a world out of the materials and on the strong foundations of a world demolished, that even clear-headed and sober-minded geologists have mistaken it for original creation. In a divine work of this kind, destructive and restorative, there must be parts in which the mode of operation is to us incomprehensible though the final end may be discerned.

3. The living beings which survived the general perdition were such as God saw fit in his unerring foresight to reserve, and by his guardianship to save for propagation in the preserved but deteriorated earth. He saved Noah and his family—the only persons then on the earth who believed in the possibility of the flood, when they saw it not with their eyes. Of other animals, "wherein was the breath of life," creatures that could not live in water, God ordained in general that two, a male and female, of all such as he designed to keep alive, should have a place and provision in the ark of safety. They belonged to the three classes, "fowls," "cattle," and "creeping things." "Of all living, of all flesh, thou shalt bring into the ark two of all, to keep alive with thee," or for keeping alive, "they shall be male and female," Gen. vi. 19. It is not two of all living, of all flesh, but two of all sorts that are for keeping alive, that is, for preservation. It appears from the narrative, that Noah was not commissioned to select and gather together the animals destined for preservation. That difficult and responsible work was not laid upon him. "Of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, and of every creeping thing after its kind, two of all, shall come unto thee, for keeping alive," and the meaning is that two of all kinds, or all in pairs, shall come unto thee which are to be kept alive. They came under the guidance of him who gave them their instincts, and who shut the mouth of lions in the presence

of a prophet in the lion's den. All that Noah was required to do was, to lay up a store of food for them, and on their coming, to bring them into the ark. Accordingly on the day he entered into the ark, of all flesh in which was the breath of life, they came unto him into the ark, two and two, all of them air-breathing animals, two and two, male and female, all beasts, cattle, reptiles, fowls, and birds, after their kind, for safe-keeping to keep seed alive after their kind on the earth. The Hebrew text, as we believe, conveys the sense we have here expressed. There may, therefore, before the flood, have been on the earth in its fields and forests, and also in its seas, rivers, and lakes, animals which have been ever since extinct, being unnecessary or unsuited to the earth in its altered state.

In the general confusion and commingling of land and water, an enormous destruction of water-animals must have ensued, of such as lived wholly in water, or mainly in water with occasional access to the air. Those in this department of life, all living creatures that had their native element, their food and home not on the dry land but in water

his essential veracity in regard to the truth of a fact, is rational faith, and in accordance with the constitution of the human mind, for the testimony certifies to the satisfaction of the believer the reality of the fact. There may be much about it that surpasses his comprehension, yet he apprehends the thing as true. There may be faith where divine testimony has no place. A man may have assurance in his belief of a natural fact, a fact having in it the substance and show of a visible reality, while to him its cause may be unknown, or known to be above nature. Every geologist who spurns, as most geologists do, the vagary of a progressive animal and vegetable development, admits that each fossil he touches is a natural reality, the remains of a former organized reality, which sprang at first from a supernatural cause and by an inconceivable process which he learns from the Bible to call *creation.* He is not, however, staggered in his profession of faith in the reality of fossils by his inability to account for them in a natural way. The mystery, the wonder that hangs around the small fossil is as great as any to be found in a universal flood. If geologists would put from them the now fragmentary idea of a progressive material development of the earth itself, they would be prepared to admit the supernatural cause of another fact, with which they come in contact in the outdoor work of their vocation every day and everywhere. It is this, that all parts of the earth, even its highest mountains, and since they became mountains, with their present elevation above the level of adjacent valleys, with their present base, slopes, and summits, were once covered with the waters of a turbid ocean. In the reality of this amazing fact the geologist believes with a full assurance of faith on the evidence of his senses; and he believes it before he attempts to account for it, for he would not set himself to the work of accounting for it unless he were persuaded of its reality. Knowing what he knows from seeing what he sees, the God of nature and of his mind does not permit him to disbelieve this fact. He may fail to account for it, or to lessen the dreadful mystery that surrounds it—still he must believe it. It is what he sees with his eyes. For it is not more distinctly stated in the pages of Genesis than it is manifest on the face of nature as it now is and has been for ages. Not only does the geo-

logist in point of fact believe on the evidence of his senses what the unlearned reader of the Bible believes on the evidence of testimony, but further the universality of an overflow of all parts of the earth at one and the same period, is virtually contended for in the geological theory in regard to universal formations, deposited each in its own period, at the bottom of a universal ocean. The turbulent inundation of the mysterious drift period, which left all that was moveable on the globe in the condition in which it now rests, was universal and over all parts of the earth at the same time.

The waters of the deluge issued from two sources—one in the firmament from which the rain poured down, "the windows of heaven were opened," the other within the earth, springs in the sea or on the land, from which increased volumes of water gushed, "all the fountains of the great deep were broken up."

In the first forty days and forty nights the waters were increased sufficiently to bear up the ark. "And it was lifted above the earth." The rain, however, continued to descend and the fountains to flow. The windows of heaven

cause was brought into active and incessant operation, which must have had, through the waters on which it immediately acted, very great effect on the vast sedimentary strata of deposits, which in the first five months, had been accumulated and spread out on the granitic flooring of continents and islands. That cause was wind, a cause which it is well known imparts the greatest violence and force to any extensive body of water, subject for any length of time, to its awakened power. "And God made a wind to pass over the earth and the waters assuaged." That wind was not light, partial, transient, and to no purpose. God by his power caused it to blow, a tempestuous wind over the whole earth, till the purpose for which it was raised was accomplished. It is plainly implied in the statement of this fact, that, up to this time, that is, during the first five months, the wind had not blown, and that, consequently, the waters in the course of their gradual rise had been, for the most part, in a state of comparative calmness. There must have been at first, on the land and in the flood, a season of general tumult and disturbance from the swelling of rivers, and universal overflow of waters washing away the soil and everything connected with it, in ruin and confusion. Its duration, however, might not have been long, and probably terminated at or soon after the end of the first forty days. For the extending bounds of the rising, expanding flood would soon extend into the land, and thus shorten and finally swallow up the streams and rivers, so that the flood would become entire with little or nothing to contend with in its advancement. Although the waters, as they continued to rise, would be affected by tides, diverse currents, and local disturbances, they were not subject to the violent agitations produced by wind.

A stormy period, however, ensued; a marked change took place as soon as the ark found a safe resting-place on the mountain. God caused a wind to pass over the earth and the waters subsided. The wind was a cause, and the subsidence an effect. The wind did not cease until the subsidence was finished. A similar, as it is not in Sacred Scripture an unfrequent, mode of describing the continued action of a cause and its coincident or attendant effect, we find in the book of Jonah: "The Lord sent out a great

wind into the sea, and there was a mighty tempest in the sea," i. 4. The wind in the air and the tempest on the sea were of the same duration. So they were in the last months of the deluge. During that whole period, or until "the earth was dried," the wind continued to blow over the waters of the retiring flood, and on the face of the ground, from which they gradually retired. Being wind, it must have blown—blowing it must have agitated the waters; these agitations of the broad surface of the flood would of course exert their force, whatever it might be, along its extended shores on the sedimentary coasts from which it would be constantly receding in its downward tendency. That wind was not a gentle gale that passed over the earth and was gone. It began when the flood was at its height, and was called into activity to act, with other causes, at a time when other active causes had in their efficiency a magnitude correspondent to the magnitude of the work then going on over the earth. When God said to Noah, "I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights, and

filled, in turning the ruins it made in his severity, into this habitable and still beautiful world. Here let me add the brief and sublime description of the flood contained in Psalm civ. "Thou coverest the earth with the deep as with a garment. The waters stood above the mountains. At thy rebuke they fled; at the voice of thy thunder they hasted away. They go up by the mountains; they go down by the valleys, unto the place which thou hast prepared for them. Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to cover the earth." The return of the waters to their own place was a retreat, a hasty and tumultuous flight, up over the mountains and down through the valleys, before the rebuke and the thunder of God. This is truth in poetry. "God caused a wind to pass over the earth and the waters subsided:" this is the same truth in history. A fact of such compass and significance, so prominently set forth in the succinct narrative, will have a parallel prominency in a true interpretation thereof.

In this dissertation on the geological developments of the inspired record of the past, we have left out of view its Divine authority, and drawn no argument from it. We do not even ask for it the credence of which it is worthy, in common with all credible ancient history. We simply claim for it the character of history, natural history, composed in antiquity, long ages before science began to look into the crust of the earth. We appeal to its plain tenor and unvarnished statements. Whether it came down through past ages from the hands of Moses or Manetho—of David or Deucalion—is the information which it furnishes in agreement with existing nature, or with the discoveries and admissions of geological science? We annex to this question an express affirmation of it. In what follows, however, we intend only to indicate the general course of argument in proof of its truth, and to point out a few stations along the line favorable for a survey of the whole ground, and for the collection of facts that may be used in constructing the argument.

1. All geologists are constrained, by evidence everywhere obvious, to allow that all present dry land, every part and layer of it, down to the unchanged granite, was

once covered with water. "Aqueous rocks, containing marine fossils, extend over wide continental tracts, and are seen in mountain chains, rising to great heights above the level of the sea. Hence it follows that what is now dry land was once under water."—Lyell's Elements, ch. 5. This is truth, self-evident in the dry land, as it is, where it is, and where alone it can answer the end for which it is fitted. The dry land is nature, and the only part of nature to which we can look for proofs of a deluge, if there are any; and there we find them, proofs positive, direct, and unequivocal, in manifold, imperishable memorials, extending to every mountain's top and to every shore. This accumulated testimony is the light of nature, to which the nations of antiquity were not indifferent, as appears in their traditions in regard to a deluge. It is the light of nature still, and the eye of sense and of science, if it be single, will see in the revelations of that light, nature's own artless, unchanging traditions of a deluge. There the dry land is in a relative position proper to it, by an ordinance of nature. It is

light of a conjectural possibility of the continents of the earth having been often under the water and above the water, through ages reaching back very far; and to confirm all this we are shown a vivid representation of a continent in a submergence, with the upper side washed beneath the cold waters of an ocean, and the under side melting and dripping away into a lake of fire. Now is there any necessity for these extravagant elaborate imaginings? None in nature; although they furnish the only hiding-place, the only strength and comfort which they can have who would fly from what is supernatural. There is a necessity, however, which arises from the pressure of an exigency which nature forces upon the wisdom of the world, either to confess, what has prima facie evidence of its truth on the face of nature, that the waters of an ocean were raised and spread out in a flood over the continents and mountains of the earth, where they now are; or, to prove from nature that these were elevated from beneath the surface of the ocean to the position which they now occupy. If the latter statement cannot be substantiated, the former will stand on the evidence it already has. Geology sanctions the idea of upheaval, attributing the upheaving force to subterranean heat. Would not an upheaval of this kind be as supernatural as an overflow of the ocean? Would the uprising of the ocean above its present level to any given height, by an increase of water from some unknown source, be more marvellous than the uprising of its entire solid bottom, in all its thickness, to the same height by the force of heat from an unknown source? Which of these is fitted most thoroughly to stagger off-hand belief? In which will captious scepticism find the less difficulty? Even if our globe had no such immense oceans and smaller seas, as it now has, nothing but springs, sparse and fitful as volcanoes, would the idea of an overflowing flood on the outside of it for a year or so be any more astounding than the idea of a flood of fire in the interior of the earth, within less than fifty miles of its surface, with power to melt the hardest rock, and at the same time to move whole continents thousands of feet up and down time and again? We have already shown that this supposed central heat could never have done the work, or produced the effects attributed to it; for in working such

effects the heat must have increased in expansive power with the decrease of its intensity, been unaffected by the law, to which all heat is subject, of constant radiation, and utterly regardless of the law of gravity in the process of making granite rock in its nether laboratory. This favorite notion of a central heat, and all the notions that cluster around it have not the light of nature nor the inherent self-evidence of truth in them. That the continents and mountains are only a bulging and swelling out of the earth's crust, that the earth has been subject from early youth to tumefactions of this kind, that this habit is constitutional, that the force of this habit is heat, that this heat in the troubled bowels of the earth originated in a nebulous or atomic condition of its elements, that these elements were generated in the womb of antiquity, and that antiquity means the next thing to eternity—all these are *ideas*, not the realities of nature, but the conjectures of mind, which it may be a very pleasant exercise for natural philosophers to talk about and lecture about, and there may be no harm in

of Mass. p. 400. This is scientific, and in the right direction. Why not go further, and recognise everywhere a flood? The action of water, however extended its operation, or permanent its effect, cannot, according to common geological theory, without a misnomer, be called diluvial. The bottom of the ocean now is not covered with a deluge. If the bottom were to be elevated into a continent or island, there would be no deluge; and any aqueous phenomena which its emerged surface might present, could not, with propriety, be called the effects of a deluge. If geologists will have the name, let them take the thing, and all will be right. Why not? Why not admit the former prevalence of a deluge commensurate with aqueous phenomena permanent on and in the dry land? Why not?

Geology has demonstrated that the present dry land, down to its crystalline foundation, is *made-land*, and was covered with the waters of an ocean at the time it was making. Two questions entirely distinct here arise.

1st. Were those overspreading waters at that time, an overflow from the ocean surpassing its natural bounds and level; that is, were they, in the true and proper sense of the word, a deluge—or were they the waters of the ocean in its ordinary state, and covering what was at that time its natural bottom. One of these they must have been, and this is the understanding of geologists. Professor Ansted, after stating how clear it is that stratified rocks were formed at the bottom of a sea, adds, "it is no less clear, either that the sea which once covered them must have sunk far below its former level, or that the whole mass of these rocks must have been elevated by subterraneous force." Ansted, Geol. ii. 169. "We must imagine, either that there has been a general lowering of the waters of the ocean, or that the solid rocks, once covered with water, have been raised up bodily out of the sea, and have thus become dry land."—Lyell El. Geol. ii. 94. Geologists have generally adopted the latter view, and have, we grant, succeeded in making the idea of repeated upheavals and submergences a cardinal doctrine of the science. We shall add nothing to what we have already set forth, for the purpose of showing that this doctrine is not well founded, that the machinery and processes it devises would not produce the results aimed at, have nothing

like them in nature or at work in nature, are contrary to the laws of nature, and are all, with the power relied upon to give them effect, purely hypothetical. If the present dry land was never raised from the bottom of a sea, we may then take for granted, what science concedes and sanctions, that it was, at its present elevation, once covered with water, and that all down to the granite is diluvial. What abundant proof does this afford, as broad, manifest, and lasting as the stratified rocks (and we have full liberty from geological science, as seen in the above extracts, to regard, use, and rely upon it as evidence), not only that there was, but must have been a universal deluge. Here the other question comes in.

2nd. Was this deluge identical with that described in the Hebrew record? Why should we not believe that the deluge recorded in nature and that recorded in Scripture are one and the same? The extinction of genera and species is no stumbling block. As for human remains—there may be reasons of which we know nothing for their absence in

able to tell the meaning of the strange figures and hieroglyphics engraved ages ago on the face of that time-worn rock, but does that inability prove that there is no rock there? We are not called upon, in an argument limited to the particular and only point brought up in this second question, to show why fucoids were lower in the mud of the flood than ferns, reeds, or forest-trees, or trilobites lower than saurians, or these lower than pachiderms. Still, it may be remarked, that in a universal deluge universal causes in their operation would be likely to produce the same effects in every part of the submerged earth at about the same time. But these and other matters of this kind belong to the general question. Was there a deluge? If there were no Bible, no historic record, or tradition of past events, *that* would be a question which even a partial geological survey of the dry land would suggest, and in suggesting answer affirmatively. Geologists, therefore, in the face of all that is seemingly or really mysterious and unaccountable in the fact, maintain that the waters of an ocean must have once covered the land to the height of its mountains, and afterwards sunk to their present level, if the present continents were not raised from the bottom of an ocean. The supposition that they were so raised is just what it was when it first bubbled up to the surface of human thought, as devoid now as it was then, of anything, discovered in nature, or discoverable by the light of nature, to give it substance. Upon the opposite supposition, that there was no such upheaval, it follows that there is on the earth sufficient proofs of the prevalence of a deluge. It is true, this concession is qualified with the supplement, that if there were one, there must have been more. This we by no means allow. Lay aside the notion of divers and successive eras of creation, and one deluge will suffice. Leave out of the account organic remains, and then all inorganic matter above the granite will indicate one deluge, continuous in its duration, and universal in its extent. Let it be admitted that this earth was deluged, not the earth as it is now, covered over with the ruins which a deluge wrought, but the earth as it was originally before sedimentary rocks were formed, and the question of *time*, as to how long it lasted, will be easily settled. A deluge of that depth and capacity, having all the

matter of the earth within its compass and under its sway, would not require a long time to make stratified sediment of it. Where the material was ample, deposition must have been rapid, and of such rapid deposition the rocks in many places bear witness. We may here enter our decided dissent from an estimate, and from a dogma of geology—the estimate concerns the great average depth or thickness of sedimentary rocks, which is very exaggerated, and inconsistent with the well-known presence of granite at the surface in many places, and the absence in others of a large portion of rocks embraced in the series that forms the basis of the estimate—the dogma is that all strata were originally horizontal—which is an assumption in the face of many facts to the contrary. As for excavations, gorges, valleys, hills, grooving, gravel, bendings, curvings, overturnings, &c., a short time, a few months would suffice for such a flood to accomplish a vast amount of that kind of work in its acting on impressible plastic newly-laid sediment. The state of things which presents the two alternatives, one of which must

earth, with that recorded in the Bible, briefly stating some particular points in which they appear to be the same.

2. The deluge, with which geology is unconsciously conversant, was universal. Aqueous phenomena, the profuse leavings of a mighty ocean, the spoils it won and lost, the deep footprints of its advancing forces, and of their disorderly retreat, are everywhere seen from shore to shore, covering all the ground which the historic deluge covered.

3. The matter and structure of stratified rocks below the drift, and the appearance of the fossils they embed, indicate that they were deposited in the waters of an ocean for the most part uniformly pacific. Descriptive geology represents that it was at first soft sediment, formed at the bottom of a sea, that was deep in most places, moved by currents, but not stirred up into violent commotion. The disturbing forces and immense movements which geologists may, in their ingenuity, devise, in connexion with upheavals and submergences, to get the strata into scientific order, aid not to derange the every day business of deposition carried on by the busy ocean. Whatever hypothetical disturbances may have agitated the regions of the nether fire, the old ocean maintained its characteristic coolness and ancient tranquillity,—did its work in quietness and composedly buried its dead. We here state a general fact, which is not, as such, altered by any local or temporary disturbances there may have been. Readers may judge how far this corresponds with what was likely to have been the condition of the sedimentary bottom of the deluge when it began to subside.

4. Organic remains furnish evidence of the universal prevalence and superiority of a system of animal and vegetable life on the earth, which, according to the idea of its formation by progressive development, the present dry land never did, and never could support. To hitch on to that evidence the inference that there were other continents that might have been better than ours, moves, but does not remove the difficulty. Apply the same mode of formation to them, and they would not become, by any conceivable series of changes, better than those which now are. The flora and fauna of geology, glorious in their relics and ruins, point back to the rich deep soil, luxuriant vegetation, and magni-

ficent cattle of the beautiful country which sin desecrated, and which passed away before the power and justice of the curse. *There* grew the shrubs and trees; *there* lived the beasts, birds, and reptiles that perished.

5. By adopting the solution of diluvial phenomena which scriptural history offers, geological science would gain a simplicity, a symmetry, and a completeness of parts which it now lacks. It denies to nature its own native comeliness, and makes it more changeable and unsettled than it now is. Mistaking a diluvial alteration of the exterior of the earth for its original formation, and thus confounding two things essentially different, and mixing them up into one, it transfers its own confusion to nature, making it to appear through vast ages mystical, defective, and self-contradicting. If the account given in the modern novel were true, our poor earth was long in a forlorn and hopeless condition. What shrinkings, and crackings, and crushings, and swellings, and tumults it passed through—under mishaps and hard usage from the start—up and down, out of the water and into the water, tossed about by the rough waves of restless change—

solitudes, with all the verdure, beauty, and riches of vegetation on every side, but without a creature to feed on it, or a bird to sing about it, or anything to enjoy its shade but a small brute of a lizard tribe. While that vegetable growth was going on so prosperously in some undiscovered country, and its riches in the way of being floated away and treasured up in certain limited localities, now called the coal-fields, or during the immeasurable ages necessary, as it is said by science, for these purposes, the rest of the earth was sitting still and looking idly on without adding an inch to the depth of its crust. The ocean was clear as crystal except where it was working at the coal-measures. The predominance in the Secondary Period of horrid reptiles, and many of gigantic size, is unseemly and unnatural. It was a long time for the earth to be given up to crocodiles, lizards, serpents, turtles, frogs, and toads, even if they were of a strange and big kind. The Tertiary Period, distinguished for its prodigious mammals, does not seem to have been adequately supplied with herbage. We might here speak of the various unnamed rivers which geologists have originated, to account for the interpolation of terrestrial remains in layers between layers of marine. One of these is required for the Wealden formation, and two or three to account for the filling up of the Paris basin. The track of these rivers is described with about as much distinctness as it would have been were it marked out with the finger on the cloudless face of the sky.

6. The tremendous destruction of life, of which the rocks bear witness, and often too, with plain evidence of its suddenness, is a proof and illustration of the truth, the literal truth, of the Hebrew record. This, we know, is contrary to the modern traditions, which have been handed down from the highest seat in the synagogue of science. They proceed from men, learned men it may be, but still men. Their authority is very great in the church and out of it, over the minds of men thinking and unthinking. No natural science ever exercised an influence and sway equal in extent to that which geology has reached over the opinions of men, not wholly by its facts, its reasonings, or demonstrations, but in part by its authority and dogmatism. That authority, strong as it may now be, is not supreme, and it

must, so far as it is not founded in truth, give way before the force of truth. The higher law written and engraven on tables of stone must sooner or later prevail. The tables are broken; but the law is not obliterated. It is the law of divine, eternal truth, self-evident in facts. It has led geologists to an acknowledgment of creation. This is the first lesson. But that is not all. The secret things of life and death after creation are inscribed there on the rocky sepulchres of entombed millions. These geology is reading —but will read better, with more ease to itself, and profit to the world, when the dark and cloudy day of hypothesis shall have wholly passed away, no more to overshadow the regions and records of death.

7. Of the same import is the extinction of animals and plants, especially of animals, of which the extinction swept from existence entire genera and species, creatures great and small. "Certainly," says Mr. Darwin, "no fact in the long history of the earth is so startling as the widespread and re-

the proper and strict sense of the word, *extinct.*" Ansted's Geol. i. 503. All was destroyed from off the face of the earth. Still, after this, the war of extermination went on, and judging from the position in which its spoils are deposited, in spots here and there, on the top of its former spoils, it went on without check or tarrying. Those deposits of the Tertiary Period, in immediate contact with those of the Secondary, were placed where they now are when the present dry land had the same shape, mountains, hills, valleys, plains, watersheds, and the same relation of part to part which it now has. "I do not think it would be possible for us now to found any conclusion whatever, as to the relative position of land and water in the northern hemisphere during the Secondary Period, from the present contour of the land; but perhaps it is not too much to say, that such relative position, and even the configuration of the land, during the whole Tertiary Period, differed comparatively little from that which now obtains in a great part of Europe. Through the ancient rocks there is also some mineral resemblance to be recognised over a considerable tract, while such resemblance is almost entirely lost in all European beds more recent than the chalk. One might, indeed, almost say, that the characteristic of Palæozoic rock was *Universality*, while that of the tertiary is, *Individuality*—for the former are rarely, but the latter most frequently local. The fossils of cotemporaneous beds are very different from one another." Ansted's Geol. ii. 3. Let the reader ponder the above. All geologists admit that the configuration of the earth was the same in the drift period that it now is: and all who adopt the *glacial theory* admit that the continents of the earth were then elevated above the present level of the ocean—for no glacier could be formed on a mountain beneath the ocean. But whatever proximate cause produced the drift, the extermination of fresh water and land animals must have been complete and universal. Not a beast of the forest or field, not a bird of the air, nor a fish of river or lake could live through that terrible period in the earth's history. Nature and Scripture tell the same story. "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land died." All air-breathing animals of every genus and species now alive on the

earth, must have been created since the drift period, or, as their remains bear witness that they were created before, two at least of every kind, a male and female, must have been kept alive by some extraordinary means in regard to which nature is silent and points to God's word for information.

8. That God caused a wind to pass over the earth during the subsidence of the waters, taken in the connexion in which it stands in the old record, fitly applies to all *that* on the face of the earth which geologists designate "diluvial drift." The mysterious drift has confounded the wisdom of the wisest geologists in all attempts to find a cause sufficient to produce the effects so named. "We might have expected, that as we are now close upon living nature, the characters of our old record would be legible and clear. But just where we begin to enter upon the physical changes going on before our eyes, our chronicle seems to fail us—a leaf has been torn out of nature's book, and the succession of events is almost hidden from our eyes." So writes a geologist in the

the deluge? There was at that time an immensity of oceanic water; that ocean might have had its tides; currents might have flowed in it from the poles to the equator. In addition to this, there was a wind to impart force and violence to its movements. How great, various, and complicated must have been the effects produced by such a body of water in its subsidence, under the impulse of the forces that pervaded and agitated it, as it dashed its waves for months against the mountains and hills of the earth, and, in its downward progress, invaded successively the newly made beds of sediment, breaking up in them a way for itself, and paths for all the rivers to the limits and level of its present domain!

Art. V.—The Doctrine of Christ's Coming and Reign is soon to be held by the Evangelical Church Generally.

Large numbers, both in Europe and this country, have become impressed by recent occurrences with the conviction that great events are at hand in the ecclesiastical as well as the civil world; and that not improbably within a brief period the papal power may be overthrown, the Turks driven from Europe, and perhaps from Christendom, and the dawn break on the earth of that blissful reign of righteousness and peace, which is promised to the church. Of the nature of that reign, however, very vague views are entertained, and obscure and mistaken notions of the controversies through which the church is to pass ere it reaches it. It especially is overlooked very generally that both the true and the false church is soon to be agitated by the question, whether Christ is to come and establish his throne on the earth; and whether the civil rulers and priests, who arrogate authority over religion and persecute, are usurpers of his rights, and thence are the antichrist whom he is to destroy at his coming: and that the true people of God are, as a body, to deny the prerogatives assumed by those persecutors, and to receive the doctrine of Christ's premillennial coming and reign; that the avowal by them of their faith on those sub-

jects and warning of the nations that the hour of judgment on the antichristian powers is at hand, is to lead to a fierce persecution; and that those events are to have an important office in preparing for the conflict in which the enemies of Christ are at length to meet their doom.

That such is to be the course of events is, however, very clearly revealed, and a knowledge and realization of it is highly important to guard the church against unwarranted expectations and false constructions of the commotions, revolutions, and catastrophes with which the world is to be agitated as the tragedy advances.

I. That Christ is to come in power and glory, destroy the monarchs and priests who persecute his disciples, and establish his throne on the earth; and that this is to become the faith of the true church, is amply foreshown in the Scriptures.

Thus, first, it is foreshown, 2 Thess. ii. 4–8, that the man of sin, who opposes himself to God, seats himself in God's tem-

were to sway the four great empires that were to tyrannize over the nations and persecute God's people. The feet of the image, formed of iron and clay, represent the governments of the ten kingdoms of the western Roman empire in their last form, when the people, symbolized by the clay, are by suffrage to have a share of political power as well as the monarchs, nobles, and others of rank, whom the iron denotes. The stone cut from the mountain without hands, which strikes the image on its feet, and dashes it to pieces, is Christ and his risen saints, whom he is to bring with him, Zech. xiv. 3; 2 Thess. i. 8–10, and who are to constitute the kingdom of the God of heaven, that is at length to fill the whole earth and is to endure for ever.

In like manner, it is foreshown, Rev. xix. 11–21, that at the great battle of God Almighty with the powers denoted by the wild beast and false prophet, Christ and the risen and glorified saints are to descend in person and glory from heaven, and that he shall then, as the avenger of his rights and of his people, tread the wine-press of wrath, dashing the wild beast and false prophet alive into the lake of fire and brimstone, and slaying the remnant with the sword of his mouth. This battle of the beast and his armies is thus to be directly with the Word from heaven and his armies, not with men in the natural life; and the destruction of the antichristian hosts is to be by the King of kings and Lord of lords whom they oppose, not by secondary agents and instrumentalities; and so also, Dan. vii. 9–12; Zech. xiv. 3; 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. It is thus revealed in the most clear and unequivocal forms that Christ is to come and in person destroy the great powers of the civil world and the false church, that are arrayed against him and his kingdom. And with this all the other teachings of the divine word on this subject are in harmony. There is no intimation in the prophecies that those usurping and persecuting powers are to be converted. There is not a hint that they are gradually to fade away under the increasing light and power of the gospel, and disappear as ignorance and barbarism vanish, under the refining and elevating arts of civilization. The only destiny that is foreshown of them is perdition by the avenging presence and power of the Redeemer, from whom they are endeavoring to wrest the sceptre of the

earth. And that this is the clear and emphatic teaching of the Scriptures, will undoubtedly be seen ere long and admitted by the true people of God. That they should now so generally overlook it; that great numbers among them should passionately deny it, and resort to the most unwarrantable artifices to erase it from these prophecies, is one of the most astonishing facts in the history of Christianity: as the reformed church has in this joined in one of the most palpable and cherished errors of the apostate church and the persecuting governments that sustain her. But the day of such sad and presumptuous misconstructions of the word of God by his own people, is, we trust, nearly over. They need only to be made aware of the error of the principles on which they proceed in the misinterpretation of these prophecies, and roused to a candid and thorough investigation of them, to lead them, as a body, to abandon their false theories and embrace the truth.

Next, it is foreshown also, in these and other prophecies, that Christ is at that epoch to establish his throne on the

ence, as they are wholly different acts and events from the investiture of Christ with the dominion of the earth, in order that the nations may be brought to serve him. All constructions of the kind are palpable perversions of the symbol and the language of the prophecy, and are devised for the mere purpose of escaping its true meaning. The prediction, therefore, foreshows a real investiture of Christ with the sceptre of the earth, and implies that he is thereafter to reign in it instead of heaven. It is foreshown, accordingly, that in order to it he is to come to our world, the scene of the judgment of the wild beast, in the pomp and glory of the King of kings. This is directly denoted by his coming in the clouds of heaven; and Christ himself, when arraigned before the high priest, alleged it as foreshowing his literal coming to our world. "And the high priest said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God. And Jesus said unto him, thou hast spoken *it.* Moreover, I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Matt. xxvi. 63, 64. It is foreshown, also, Zech. xiv. 9–21, that when he comes with all his saints, and destroys the host arrayed against him, he shall become the king over all the earth, and all nations shall serve him; and Rev. xi. 15, that at the sound of the seventh trumpet, the kingdom of the world shall become his, and he shall reign for ever and ever. And so in many other passages, as Ps. ii.; Isaiah ii., lxvi.; Matt. xxiv., xxv.; 2 Thess. i. and ii.

It is most certainly revealed then, that Christ is at that epoch to come to the earth in glory, and receive and reign over it as his empire. And this great certainty which he has so distinctly and impressively made known, will undoubtedly, ere long, be received and welcomed by the church. That it should be disbelieved, and eagerly denied, and treated with scorn and aversion by any who truly love the Saviour, is indeed astonishing.

Thirdly. But the grounds on which it is rejected are so false, absurd, and subversive of the whole system of revealed truth, that whenever those who sincerely receive the Scriptures as of authority, can be brought to an unprejudiced re-study of the subject, they will relinquish the mistaken

views into which they have been betrayed, and embrace the doctrine that Christ is to come and reign on the earth, as among the most certain and most precious that are presented to us in the divine word.

The ground on which it is rejected is not that it is not clearly taught, if the language in which it is expressed is to be interpreted according to its proper meaning, and the symbols through which it is represented are to be construed on the principles on which those of them that are interpreted by the Spirit are used. But it is asserted that that though their natural is not their prophetic sense, but is the mere vehicle of a remoter and more spiritual meaning. Thus, it is admitted that the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven, in a prophetic vision, as in Dan. vii. 13, 14, and the direct prediction in language that he is so to come, Matt. xxiv. 30, actually denote, interpreted by the proper laws of symbols and language, his literal coming in the clouds; yet it is held that that meaning is merely representative of a wholly different event; the act of a different agent, some

but is against their clearest teachings; that it is in utter violation of the laws of language and symbols; that it has no ground, whatever, but a presumptuous and arbitrary fancy, the very aim of which is to set aside the truth; and that if legitimate, it strikes from the sacred page all the great revelations God has made respecting the future? For if the prediction of Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven is not a prediction of that event, but only of some wholly different occurrence of which men perhaps, or material nature is to be the subject, then we have no revelation that he is ever again to come to our world, even to raise the dead or judge the living: and if his coming to raise the dead is no prediction of his coming for that purpose, then for the same reason, his prediction that he is to raise the dead can be no prediction of that event; his announcement that those who believe in him are to exist for ever in holiness and happiness, can be no announcement of their endless existence; and so of every other prophecy and promise he has uttered in respect to our future being. On the same principles also, his first coming may be denied, his ministry, his crucifixion, his resurrection, and his ascension to heaven. Every reality in the work of redemption is struck, at a blow, from our grasp, and nothing is left but the dreams of a lawless and besotted fancy. This is not conjecture; for these results have actually been reached by a vast body of allegorists and spiritualizers who adopt that method of interpretation, and in consistency apply it to the whole body of the Scriptures, historical and didactic, as well as prophetic. Is it to be believed that the true people of God, and the most gifted, learned, and conscientious among them, will adhere to this monstrous system, when led thus to discern the ground on which it rests, and see the false and destructive faiths in which it terminates? We cannot believe it. It is against their character as renovated persons. It is against God's dealings with his renewed people. It is a great law of his providence that the truth which he communicates to them distinctly, becomes the means, at length, of setting them free from the errors in which they are held; and leading them to know, and love, and trust him as he reveals himself to them; and that feature of his faithfulness and love will appear in his dealings with them, in regard to this great doctrine of his word.

views into which they have been betrayed, and embrace the doctrine that Christ is to come and reign on the earth, as among the most certain and most precious that are presented to us in the divine word.

The ground on which it is rejected is not that it is not clearly taught, if the language in which it is expressed is to be interpreted according to its proper meaning, and the symbols through which it is represented are to be construed on the principles on which those of them that are interpreted by the Spirit are used. But it is asserted that that though their natural is not their prophetic sense, but is the mere vehicle of a remoter and more spiritual meaning. Thus, it is admitted that the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven, in a prophetic vision, as in Dan. vii. 13, 14, and the direct prediction in language that he is so to come, Matt. xxiv. 30, actually denote, interpreted by the proper laws of symbols and language, his literal coming in the clouds; yet it is held that that meaning is merely representative of a wholly different event; the act of a different agent, some

but is against their clearest teachings; that it is in utter violation of the laws of language and symbols; that it has no ground, whatever, but a presumptuous and arbitrary fancy, the very aim of which is to set aside the truth; and that if legitimate, it strikes from the sacred page all the great revelations God has made respecting the future? For if the prediction of Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven is not a prediction of that event, but only of some wholly different occurrence of which men perhaps, or material nature is to be the subject, then we have no revelation that he is ever again to come to our world, even to raise the dead or judge the living: and if his coming to raise the dead is no prediction of his coming for that purpose, then for the same reason, his prediction that he is to raise the dead can be no prediction of that event; his announcement that those who believe in him are to exist for ever in holiness and happiness, can be no announcement of their endless existence; and so of every other prophecy and promise he has uttered in respect to our future being. On the same principles also, his first coming may be denied, his ministry, his crucifixion, his resurrection, and his ascension to heaven. Every reality in the work of redemption is struck, at a blow, from our grasp, and nothing is left but the dreams of a lawless and besotted fancy. This is not conjecture; for these results have actually been reached by a vast body of allegorists and spiritualizers who adopt that method of interpretation, and in consistency apply it to the whole body of the Scriptures, historical and didactic, as well as prophetic. Is it to be believed that the true people of God, and the most gifted, learned, and conscientious among them, will adhere to this monstrous system, when led thus to discern the ground on which it rests, and see the false and destructive faiths in which it terminates? We cannot believe it. It is against their character as renovated persons. It is against God's dealings with his renewed people. It is a great law of his providence that the truth which he communicates to them distinctly, becomes the means, at length, of setting them free from the errors in which they are held; and leading them to know, and love, and trust him as he reveals himself to them; and that feature of his faithfulness and love will appear in his dealings with them, in regard to this great doctrine of his word.

Fourthly. Great events are to occur that will show in impressive forms, the utter error of that method of allegorizing the prophecies, and make it clear that they are to be interpreted by the indubitable laws of language and symbols; and that the coming and reign of Christ therefore are to be literal.

Thus the revolution in the ten kingdoms, by which an imperial chief is to be placed over them, in whom the supreme authority is lodged, and to whom the kings give their power, will be an accomplishment of the prophecy, Rev. xvii. 11–13, literally, not allegorically interpreted. What it can mean indeed, allegorically construed, no one can show. A change of such stupendous moment, and attracting the gaze and wonder of the whole world, Rev. xvii. 8, cannot fail to impress all impartial students of the prophecy with the conviction that its future, like its past accomplishments, are to take place in the identical events which its language and symbols most naturally denote. The allegorical theory cannot possibly be made to consist with such a fulfilment of the

civil rights, a non-existence in a political relation. When their martyrdom is found to be a literal one, and to have taken place in exactly the form, and to be followed in the most minute particulars by the peculiar arrangements that are predicted for the preservation and exposure of the bodies unburied, how will it be possible for men of sense and truthfulness to doubt that it is a literal accomplishment of the prophecy, and maintain with obstinacy and passion, as many now do, that those predictions have no such meaning, but must be allegorized, or spiritualized, to reach their true import? It cannot be. They who are still under the blinding influence of sin, sceptics, uncompromising infidels, unprincipled partisans and demagogues, who have sinister ends to gain by persistence in error, doubtless may and will; but the humble, docile, truth-loving children of God, who are under the guidance of his Spirit, cannot.

But if a disposition to wrest the prophecy by that lawless method lingers still in the breasts of any, the resurrection of the witnesses from death in glory and ascent to heaven, will strike it from existence. Who, in the presence of that stupendous miracle, will be able to doubt and deny that it is exactly what the prophecy literally foreshows, and what the witnesses themselves and their friends had anticipated? Not even their slaughterers, who had expected to see the prophecy confuted by their non-resurrection. For we are told that great fear is to fall on the enemies of the martyrs, who are to witness their rising from death and assumption to heaven, and that those who survive the commotion that is to follow, are to be affrighted and give glory to the God of heaven. Will the true children of God continue to doubt, and wrench, and torture the prophecy to get rid of its genuine and verified meaning, when the murderers of his witnesses, who had up to that hour continued under the power of unbelief, are compelled to see and admit its fulfilment, and, trembling at their guilt, give glory to God? It cannot be.

And so of other events, such as the fall of Babylon, the return of the Jews, the proclamation of the gospel to all nations, the sealing of the servants of God. The false constructions that are now put on them by those who deny the personal coming and reign of Christ, will be confuted by

their accomplishment according to the natural sense of the prophecies in which they are foreshown. That there will still be unbelievers, we doubt not, as there were when the predictions respecting Christ's first coming, ministry, and death were fulfilling; but they will be the enemies of Christ, not his friends; they will be of the party of the wild beast and false prophet, who are to endeavor to intercept him from establishing his throne on the earth—not his renewed people. These will be looking for his appearing and kingdom.

Fifthly. This is confirmed by the prediction, that a body of teachers is to arise, who are to announce to the world that Christ is about to appear, and summon it to pay a true worship to God. Thus the angel that flew through mid-heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, is the symbol of a body of men who are in a public and conspicuous manner to proclaim the message he uttered to all the nations and tribes of the earth. And his message was, "Fear God and give him

shows that all are then to look for his speedy appearance; though the neglect of the five foolish virgins to provide oil for their lamps indicates that a part of the people of God then in life will not be prepared for admission to the kingdom (which is to involve a change from mortal to immortal), and will be for a season excluded from it, to their deep dishonor and grief.

It is thus abundantly clear that ere the great moment arrives of Christ's advent, the church of true believers is, as a body, to become aware that his coming is nigh, and that the doctrine of his coming is to be an important element of the message which they are to proclaim to the nations in preaching to them the everlasting gospel.

II. It is indicated also that at the period of this great revolution in the faith of the true church, earnest and exciting discussions are to arise and agitate the political and religious world on the question whether the civil governments and the ecclesiastical hierarchies have a right to legislate, as they do, over Christianity and the church; to dictate to those under their jurisdiction the faith they shall hold and the worship they shall offer; and to persecute such as refuse submission to their sway: that the monarchs and priests will assert and maintain the rightfulness of this prerogative they have assumed over Christianity and over their subjects; but that the true people of God will deny it and show their assumptions to be an arrogation of the rights of God.

Thus the utterances of the angel flying through midheaven, "Fear God and give glory to him," and "worship him who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters," imply that the nations will then be paying to other beings the homage due to him, and may be regarded, therefore, as referring to the charge in the prophecy, that the population of the Roman empire worships the dragon, the wild beast, and the image; and as it is unquestionably an injunction to worship God in distinction from those rulers and priests, it indicates that the guilt of worshipping them will be seen and felt by those whom the angel represents, and thence that it will be disowned and denounced by the true church at large of the period.

The resurrection of the witnesses will be a public and

resistless demonstration from God himself, that the authority assumed by the civil rulers and Catholic hierarchy is an impious usurpation of the divine rights. For if those persecutors truly have the authority which they claim and exercise in putting the martyrs to death, then the martyrs will deserve to die for refusing obedience to that authority. Their resurrection, therefore, will be a vindication of them of the greatest possible expressiveness and grandeur from that charge, and an equal condemnation of their persecutors. The fact, accordingly, that their resurrection and ascension to heaven, is immediately to be followed by an earthquake —the symbol of a violent political revolution, and the fall of the dynasty of one of the ten kingdoms, indicates that it will be regarded by the people as a demonstration that the rulers and priests are usurpers in their assumption of legislative and judicial authority over God's people. It thus shows that that question is to become of commanding interest to both parties, and that a judgment is to be rendered against the persecutors by men as well as by God.

This is shown also by the fall of Babylon, and the public

so manifest, that those whom she had made the victims of her arts, are led to regard her with detestation and horror, and demand with an earnestness and determination that cannot be resisted, that she shall be stripped of her authority. The effect of her severance from the state will be to divest her of this exclusive right to teach, she has drawn from it, and of her power also, to extort revenues from her vassals, and to enforce her faith and worship on men by persecution. The angel that proclaims her fall is the symbol of a body of conspicuous and authoritative men who are to announce her fall and exult over it; and the reason given by the angel for her overthrow, is the reason they are to give for it: and that is, that she has enforced on the nations by her usurped authority and the power she had drawn from the state, an idolatrous and vile religion. "She made (enticed, constrained) the nations to drink the maddening wine of her fornication." That act ascribed to her, is the symbol of the forbidden and idolatrous worship into which she entices and drives her victims; and her maddening cup of wine represents the deluding arts and infuriating excitements by which she allures them within her power, and inflames them with delight in her false deities, and false method of redemption, and false worships. The ground presented by the angel for her overthrow thus is, that she has apostatized from God and instituted a false, debasing, and impious idolatry in place of the gospel, and by the vilest and most profligate arts drawn and driven the nations to embrace her false system. All this denotes, accordingly, that her conduct has been thoroughly canvassed, and the principles on which she has proceeded come to be understood, and the conviction become general and resistless that she is an impious apostate from God and usurper of his rights, in her pretexts of authority over Christianity and over man; and thence that the state is guilty of an equal usurpation and apostasy in legalizing her in her heaven-daring claims, and arming her with power to enforce them on their subjects. How else could they ascribe to her such a character? Why else should they exult over her fall? If she is not a usurper, if she has the authority which she claims, she is entitled to a legalization by the state, and her religion should be received as obligatory. But her overthrow, instead of being

unjust to her, is only to divest her of power to which she has no right, and restore to God and man what she has wickedly usurped from them.

This is shown, also, by the other angel who descended from heaven, and proclaiming her fall and the debasement to which she had sunk, gave her impiety and profligacy as the reason of her overthrow. "And I saw another angel descending from heaven having great authority, and the earth was lighted with his resplendence; and he cried with a strong voice saying, She has fallen, has fallen, great Babylon, and become a habitation of demons, and a station of every impure spirit, and a station of every unclean and hated bird; because all the nations have drunk of the wine of the fury of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth have waxed rich through the strength of her luxury," chap. xviii. 1–3. The resplendence of the angel indicates that the body of men whom he represents are to be of a higher rank, or invested with greater authority, and attract a larger measure of attention than those symbolized by the other angel. As he descended immediately from heaven and had great authority, so those whom he represents are to be seen and felt to be the messengers of God, and their words are to command the undoubting faith and acquiescence of those whom they address. As the earth was lighted by his effulgence, so they are to attract all eyes and impress all minds by their presence and the beauty and joyfulness of their office. In order to answer to the grandeur of the symbol, they must be of a lofty rank in intelligence, rectitude, and dignity, and be invested with extraordinary authority as God's messengers, and possessed of vast power over the minds of men. The [illegible] body of such men to announce the fall of [illegible] and persecuting hierarchy, and the [illegible] she had sunk, bespeaks the occasion [illegible] moment. That after her fall, she [illegible] of demons and a station of [illegible] birds, signifies that she [illegible] and most impious of [illegible] assigned for it and [illegible] *from God*; that [illegible]

rity instituted a false and idolatrous religion, and has, by impudent and profligate arts, drawn the nations and their rulers to accept it as God's. That the usurping and persecuting church is thus to be separated from the state and divested of all her power to enforce her false worship, and that a great body of conspicuous and authoritative men are to proclaim her fall and exult over it, because she has set up a false religion and has enticed and forced the nations to adopt it, thus shows clearly that the right of a state to nationalize a church, and of a church to legislate over religion, dictate the faith of the people, and persecute those who refuse submission to her authority, is soon to be strenuously and successfully questioned; and that those who deny the arrogated rights of the state and church are to receive the concurrence of the people so generally that the head of the empire will be forced to denationalize the hierarchy which he shortly before will have reinstated in its ancient power, indicates emphatically that the subject is to become of extraordinary and supreme interest to the nations, and is to be discussed with the greatest thoroughness and passion.

But this is shown still more decisively by the announcement of the angel that next followed. "And another, a third angel, followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any one worship the wild beast and its image, and receive a mark on his forehead or on his hand, he shall even drink of the wine of the wrath of God, poured an unmixed wine into the cup of his indignation, and shall be tormented in fire and brimstone before the holy angels and before the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment ascends for ever and ever. And they have no rest day and night who worship the wild beast and its image, and whoever receives [illegible] of its name," Rev. xiv. 9–11.

[illegible] proclaimed the fall of Babylon, and ex- [illegible] because of her apostasy and seduction of [illegible]y. This denounces a doom on those who [illegible] the wild beast, or its image, or receive a [illegible]nd or hand, as a symbol of submission to [illegible] The wild beast is the symbol of the [illegible]lize the church. Worshipping the [illegible] ascription to it of the divine rights [illegible] its subjects in legislating over them in

their immediate relations to God, and claiming authority to dictate the faith they shall hold, and the worship they shall offer. As in that legislation they in fact claim to be of higher authority over their subjects than God; their subjects in assenting to that legislation over them, professing the faith they appoint, and offering the worship they enjoin, in effect treat them as though they had the prerogatives of God which they assume, and were entitled to a divine homage. The angel, accordingly, in denouncing such a doom on those who offer that worship, in effect denounces with equal emphasis the exaction of that worship by the civil rulers; and thereby exhibits the nationalization of the church by the civil government as a crime of the greatest enormity against God. Their violation of the rights of God in demanding that homage must be as great as that of their subjects is in yielding it to them. The one must be the correlative of the other. The image of the wild beast is the Catholic hierarchy of the ten kingdoms, having the pope as its head. It is called the image of the beast because it is formed after the pattern of the imperial government of the Roman empire

are guilty, and concurrence in it by the people, as among the greatest of crimes, and will exert themselves to put an end to it.

These prophecies thus show, in a very impressive manner, that the question whether the civil governments have a right to nationalize the church, and the church the right to dictate the faith of the people, and enforce it by penalties, is to be discussed with the greatest earnestness as involving the prerogatives of God, and the allegiance to him of his creatures; that the true people of God are, as a body, to deny to the civil rulers and priests the authority they claim over men in their immediate relations to God, and over his relations to them, and are to assert his exclusive right to legislate in religion, and appoint the faith and homage of men; and that they are to vindicate the truth with such power as to carry the great body of the people with them, and constrain the rulers to sever the usurping and persecuting church from the state, and divest her of her power to enforce her will by decrees and persecutions.

III. But though the civil government is to denationalize the church, and she is to lose the power she derived from it to enforce her decrees, they are not to relinquish the authority they have assumed over the faith of the people, but are still to endeavor to retain them under their sway.

Thus the angel that descended from heaven and pronounced the doom on those who should thereafter worship the beast and its image, or receive a badge of submission to them; added, "Here is the patience of the saints who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." And John says, "And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write, Blessed are the dead who hereafter die in the Lord; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their toils, and their works follow with them," chap. xix. 12, 13; which imply that the people of God are to be subjected to severe trials by the anti-christian party after the fall of Babylon, and that some of them are to be put to death. The monarchs and prelates then are not to disavow the authority they have so long assumed; but are to continue to assert and, in a measure, enforce it. And this is in accordance with the teachings in many other prophecies. It is nowhere intimated that the wild beast is ever to abandon

or cease to exercise the right he arrogates to determine the faith and worship of his subjects. Instead, he is to go on usurping, and making war on the saints and the Lamb, to the last. Nor is the man of sin and son of perdition who seats himself in the temple of God, and claims that he is God, ever formally to abdicate that throne and recant his assumption of the divine rights; but is to maintain his seat in the temple, and continue to proclaim himself God, till overwhelmed by the brightness of Christ's appearance, and consumed by the avenging fires that are to issue from his lips. And this final persecution, like that undoubtedly of the witnesses, is to be directed immediately against those who look for the speedy advent of Christ and the establishment of his throne on the earth.

This is seen from the aim of the demon spirits that are emitted from the mouth of the wild beast, and from the mouth of the dragon, and from the mouth of the false prophet. The time of their emission is immediately after the resurrection of the witnesses. And it is apparent from the

who believe it, by a direct war on Christ himself, as they will regard it, by capturing and dispersing again the Jews who will have returned, and re-established themselves in Palestine. "They are spirits of demons working wonders, that go to the kings of the whole world to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he who watches and keeps his garments, that he may not walk naked, and they may see his shame. And they gathered them in the place which is called in Hebrew Armageddon." Chap. xvi. 14–16. Their aim is, therefore, to be to confute the prophecy that Christ is to come and establish his throne in Jerusalem, such as Ps. ii.; Isaiah ii. lxv.; Luke i. 31–33. It implies accordingly that it is to be the faith of the whole body of pure believers who are then to testify against the wild beast and false prophet, and be the objects of persecution, that Christ is speedily to come and enter on his reign on the earth. The battle of that great day of God Almighty, is the battle of the day in which the question—affirmed by the people of God, and denied by his enemies—is to be determined, namely, whether Christ will come in power and glory as he has promised, Zech. xiv., and deliver his covenant people returned to Jerusalem, whom the wild beast, the false prophet, and the kings and their armies, will have assembled to slaughter and disperse. It is to be a battle against him, because the aim of the hostile hosts will be to confute his pledges to his people, and demonstrate that he is not to come and reign over the world. But Christ is to come, and come as a thief, so that they even of his own people, who are not watching, will be overwhelmed with shame.

The sealing of the servants of God and the reward they receive, indicate also that they are to be put to a severe test of their allegiance to him, by the claims of the wild beast and Babylon to supreme authority in religion. The time of the sealing is to be that of the sixth seal, and immediately before a tempestuous agitation of the nations, and excitement to violent and destructive revolution. The sealing or stamping the name of God on the foreheads of his servants, denotes their being subjected to influences by which it shall be made apparent to spectators that they indubitably are his children; and the mode in which their true and unal-

terable allegiance to him will be made as manifest as though his name were graven on their brows, it is shown by the character given them, chap. xiv. 1–5, is their full and unfaltering refusal of homage to Babylon, the nationalized, idolatrous, and persecuting Catholic hierarchy. "These are they who were not defiled with women; for they are pure. They are redeemed from among men, a first-fruit to God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth no falsehood was found; for they are blameless." To be defiled with women is, in the sense of the prophecy, to be defiled with the woman Babylon and her daughters, the nationalized hierarchies, that claim supreme authority in religion, and institute a false faith and a false worship, by submitting to their claims, and offering their idolatrous homage. That no falsehood in that relation was found in their mouth, denotes that their profession of allegiance to God is absolute, sincere, and consistent; and is sustained by a denial of all submission to the usurped and conflicting authority of the false church. This shows, in an emphatic manner, that their fidelity to God in that relation is to be put to a severe trial.

and the Lamb shall overcome them; for he is Lord of lords and King of kings," chap. xvii. 11–14. And it is in that character, as usurpers of his throne, that he is to dash them to destruction, and vindicate his right to the dominion of the world. The conflict is accordingly to be a real conflict; the presence of Christ at it, a real personal presence; and the destruction of the hosts that make war on him, a real destruction. To deny it is not only to offer the most direct contradiction to the symbols and the language through which it is foreshown, and deny that Christ is to come a second time to our world, but is to turn it into a revelation that creatures are still to occupy the seat which the antichristian powers have usurped and struggle to maintain. For if Christ's coming to the great battle foretold in these prophecies, Rev. xix. 11–21, Dan. vii. 9–14, Zech. xiv. 1–9, 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, is not a personal coming, then we have no prediction that can justly be considered as foreshowing that he is to come a second time. And moreover, if in the vision of his coming with the armies of heaven, Rev. xix. 11–21, and destroying the wild beast, the false prophet, and the kings and their armies, he does not represent himself, and his coming symbolize his real personal coming, but, as is maintained by those who reject this construction, he is a representative of creatures, then the rights he represents and vindicates cannot be his own, but must be the rights of those whom he symbolizes. The battle must consequently be regarded as a mere battle between creatures; and the aim of those who fight against the wild beast and false prophet can only be to assert and maintain—not that Christ—but that they themselves, instead of those denoted by the wild beast, are of supreme authority in religion; and the result of the battle can be only that another set of creatures, instead of the man of sin and son of perdition, will seat themselves in the temple and throne of God! Such is the issue of the pretext that Christ's coming, in the vision, does not denote his real coming at the battle, nor the victory foreshow a literal victory he is to gain in contest with his usurping rivals for the throne of the world! What more pitiable spectacle was ever exhibited by men than they thus present, who, under the pretence of honoring Christ, in effect deny that he is ever to return to the earth, and make

the prophecies of his coming in power and glory to conquer his rivals and reign over the race, prophecies of the assumption of his throne by a new order of men, who will, in a slightly altered shape, perpetuate antichrist through an endless round of years! How long will conscientious men continue to pursue that course? Not an hour after they can be induced intelligently and carefully to study the teachings of the Divine word on the subject. For they will scarce have advanced a step in such an investigation, ere they will discover that it is an invariable law of symbols, that agents represent agents, not acts or events. As then Christ appears as the great agent in the vision (Rev. xix. 9–21) in which the wild beast, the false prophet, and the kings and their armies are destroyed, he either represents himself as to appear in the scene which the vision foreshows, or else he symbolizes some other agent or agents as to appear in that scene, in the sphere in which he appeared in the vision, and act the part his action in that sphere in the vision foreshows. But he acted in the vision as the King

coming and reign of Christ, will be one of the greatest and most joyous that has ever taken place in the faith of the true church. The discovery and reception of the great doctrine that he is to come and reign over the earth as his kingdom, will be to multitudes of believers much what the resurrection of Christ from the dead was to the apostles and first disciples. It will raise them out of an abyss of darkness, extricate them from a crowd of false thoughts and expectations, clear up perplexities, show the Scriptures to be intelligible, truthful, and consistent, and exhibit the work and purposes of Christ in a greatness and glory that are suitable to his perfections, and invest the future with ineffable interest and beauty.

The change, however, will be one of the most natural, and the easiest ever wrought; as though it will doubtless be the result of extraordinary influences of the Spirit, great and startling providences, and strenuous endeavors of faithful men to make known the truth; they will accomplish their work chiefly by simply rousing attention, overcoming prejudice, exciting a disposition to re-study the subject, and pointing out the mistaken principles of exposition on which they proceed who reject the doctrine of Christ's reign, and unfolding and proclaiming the simple and indubitable teachings of the divine word.

The change will be greater to believers generally in Europe, than in this country; as it is there held by the evangelical that the state may and ought to nationalize the church. Many even of the Millenarians of Great Britain are earnest advocates of the church establishment, and maintain that the authority assumed by the government in legislating over religion, and dictating to the subject what faith he shall hold, and what worship he shall offer, is no encroachment on the divine rights. When, however—the supreme power having passed back from Protestant to Catholic hands,—the wild beast shall, in virtue of the prerogative they now concede to the government, demand that they shall renounce their faith in the pure gospel, and embrace the superstition and idolatry of the papacy in its place, their eyes will be opened to the utter error of conceding to men such a dominion over creatures in their immediate relations to God; and they will recoil from it

with horror; and all, when brought to an unprejudiced and earnest consideration of the subject, will reject, with an equal sense of its unjustifiableness, the method of interpreting the divine word to which they are now addicted, by setting aside its grammatical meaning and substituting a wild allegorical fiction in its place.

Though those who look for the glorious appearing soon of the great God and our Saviour, may justly be cheered by this assurance of the speedy acceptance by the church of the faith they cherish—it eminently behoves them implicitly to follow the guidance of the divine word in the measures they take to correct the errors that prevail on this subject, and unfold and give diffusion to the truth. The great numbers, the powerful parties, and the deep prejudices that are arrayed against them, make it apparent that they are to have numerous, adroit, and resolute opponents, who can only be met by good sense, learning, truth, candor, earnestness, and consistency. Declamation, unsupported constructions, crude speculation, baseless theories, are not the means

nant spirits, and ravenous and hated birds, implies that there is to be a crowd of active and desperate persons who will sympathize and co-operate with her during her struggle to maintain her place, though they will not openly join her ranks till after her fall. The great battle the people of God are to fight against these powerful and malignant foes, is to be fought by knowledge, truth, skill, fidelity, wisdom, and by nothing else. The ignorant, the dreamy, the rash, the vain, who prophesy out of their own heart, and make the word of God the instrument of personal ends, will only injure the cause which they effect to befriend.

When the subject comes to engage general attention, and be earnestly discussed, there will, as on all other questions, be two parties, and many doubtless will take the side of error, who, it might have been hoped, would embrace the truth. There are now individuals who regard the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign with such prejudice and contempt, that it is not to be expected that any proof of its truth, however decisive, will reconcile them to it. They dislike it for its nature, not because it is not supported by adequate evidence. And thence they probably will go on in disbelief, scorn, and denunciation; and when driven by the progress of events to see and feel their mistake, will, in their rage and malignity, join the hostile party; as those represented by demons, unclean spirits, and hated birds, are to make Babylon, after its fall, their resort and habitation, though they had not dwelt in it before. The humble, ingenuous, truth-loving children of God will take a very different course. Though they may now, from the influence of false-teaching, place a mistaken construction on the prophecies that relate to Christ's advent and kingdom; as events advance they will be roused to a fresh investigation of the subject, and in the brighter light that will then be thrown on it, will discover and renounce their error and embrace the truth, and some of them, not improbably, will show their allegiance to Christ by surrendering their lives for his sake. The certainty thus foreshown that they are soon to be constrained to decide respecting the doctrine of Christ's coming, and their reception or rejection of it be a test of their fitness or unfitness, for his kingdom, should at once rouse them from indifference, put them on their guard against false preposses-

sions, and prompt them to a solemn, candid, and thorough inquiry after the truth. Instead of obstinate ignorance and prejudice, how much more becoming is it on such a question to take the attitude of learners. In place of blindly following the rash speculations and delusive dreams of human guides, how much wiser to look directly to the word of God for instruction. And instead of endeavoring to get rid of its announcements by childish pretexts and unscrupulous artifices, how much more befitting to receive them in their natural and indubitable sense, and bend in adoring submission to the purposes they reveal, which are infinitely more propitious to men and more glorious to God than the human fancies for which they are rejected.

Blessed be God, he will give those who love him, and are called according to his purpose, the aids that they need to lead them to the truth. It is his enemies only who will not have Christ to reign over them whom he will leave to reject and scoff at the promise of his coming, and meet, for their hostility, the sentence of exclusion from his kingdom.

and were very numerous. They were borne out of the temples and private dwellings in which they had been stationed, to be carried off by the conquerors. "Your burdens," that is, the images and other sacred articles thus carried by the captors from the temples, palaces, and dwellings, were now, instead of being borne by the hands of men, who might regard them with a measure of reverence, "to be lifted up as a load to the weary beast."

3, 4. Hypocatastases.—"They stoop, they bow together. They cannot deliver the load. They are themselves gone into captivity," vs. 2. They, the gods, are again exhibited as stooping and bowing, and together—as though uniting their strength in a struggle to save their images from being carried into exile. That they cannot deliver the load, signifies that they cannot wrench it from the hands of the captors. Instead, they themselves were carried into captivity; that is, their own statues, which were eminently regarded as themselves, and in fact comprised their whole being, of which their ordinary images were but copies—were carried into exile. Those boasted gods, instead of saving their worshippers, were not to be able even to save themselves, and were to be borne off as helpless as any other dead matter, and as wearying a load to the animals on which they were to be placed. What a proof of their nothingness, and of the senselessness and madness of those who looked to them for protection!

5. Apostrophe.—"Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel—those borne from the belly; those carried from the womb; and to old age I am he, and to hoar hair I will bear *you*. I have done it, and I will bear, and I will carry and will save *you*," vs. 3, 4. God calls the Israelites to consider the contrast presented by his agency towards them. He had borne them from the very dawn of their being to old age: and he was still to sustain and to save them. He chose them as his people ere they came into life. He had continually nurtured and defended them. He had never deserted them. He had never proved inadequate to deliver them from their enemies, or bestow on them the blessings they needed. Could there be any room for doubt whom they ought to love, trust, and obey as their God?

6, 7. Metonymies in the use of house for the family of Jacob and of Israel.

"To whom will ye liken me, and equal and compare me, that we may be like?" vs. 5. That is, with whom will you represent me as on a level in attributes, relations, and agency, so that he with whom you compare me shall be shown to have as high a title to your homage as I have? Can you persuade yourselves that a mere sculptured shape, the work of man, without intelligence and without sense, is a deity equal to me?

"They lavish gold out of the bag, and weigh silver in the balance; they hire a goldsmith, and he will make it a god. They will bow down, yea, they will fall prostrate. They will lift him on the shoulder, they will carry him, they will set him in his place, and he will stand; from his place he will not remove. Yea, one will cry to him, and he will not answer; from his distress he will not save him," vs. 6, 7. Shall such a helpless, senseless thing, be regarded as equal to the self-existent, ever-living, almighty, all-knowing

from ancient time the things which are not yet done; saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure; calling a bird of prey from the east, the man of my counsel from a far country. I have both spoken and I will bring it to pass; I have formed the purpose, and I will also do it," vs. 9–11. God calls them to consider the events of former times, in which he had shown himself to be the Almighty, and that there is no other, and none like him that foreshows the future, and has such a dominion over the earth and over men that he can accomplish all his pleasure in regard to them. For these, omnipotence, omniscience, universal dominion, a purpose that embraces all things, and the execution of it, are marks of the true God, and belong only to him; and these attributes he was to continue to display, and especially in verifying the predictions he had made in regard to Cyrus, and the restoration through him, of Israel from the exile into which they were to be carried by the Babylonians.

"Hearken to me, ye stout-hearted, who are far from righteousness. I bring near my righteousness. It shall not be far off; and my salvation, it shall not tarry; and I will place in Zion my salvation to Israel my glory," vs. 12, 13. He now summons even the sceptical and rebellious among them to listen to a promise, the verification of which was again to demonstrate and exemplify his deity. He would display his truth and righteousness in their very presence, not simply in Persia, where he would raise Cyrus to the throne, nor in Babylon, of which he would make him the conqueror, but in Jerusalem itself. He would bestow a salvation on his captive people that should include their actual restoration to their own land, and their re-establishment in Zion, their capital, and the seat of their worship.

Chapter xlvii. God now foreshows the overthrow of Babylon, which was to be in order to the restoration of the Israelites from exile, vs. 1–5. The reason of her overthrow was her cruelty to God's people, whom he delivered into her hand, and her pride and self-confidence, vs. 6–10. Her destruction was to come suddenly, and her magical arts and enchantments, in which she trusted, were to prove deceptive and worthless, vs. 11–15.

1. Apostrophe to Babylon. "Come down and sit in the

dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon; sit on the ground. There is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans," vs. 1.

2, 3. Metaphors in denominating the population of Babylon, virgin daughter of Babylon, and daughter of the Chaldeans, to denote their beauty, their delicacy, and the ease and dignity from which they were to descend.

4, 5. Hypocatastases in the use of "come down" from a higher position and "sit on the ground," to denote a descent from luxury and power to subjugation and dishonor. The inhabitants of the city are addressed as though they were a princess who had before occupied a throne and been treated with the respect due to one of rank in the delicacy and beauty of youth. But there is now no longer a throne on which she can sit. Babylon has become the captive of a conqueror, and she must quit the palace and sit on the ground. "For thou shalt no longer be called tender and delicate. Take the millstones and grind meal. Uncover (that is, lift up) thy veil. Lift up thy skirt; uncover the leg; cross the streams. Let thy nakedness be uncovered;

disfigured by the hardships of a slave, she would no longer be the object of admiration and praise. She was to lose also her title, mistress—that is, metropolis—of kingdoms.

8, 9. Hypocatastases, "I was wroth against my people, I profaned my heritage; and I gave them into thy hand. Thou didst not show them mercy. Upon the aged thou didst lay thy yoke very heavily," vs. 6. Giving his people into the hand of the Chaldeans, is put for surrendering them to their power. Laying a yoke on the aged very heavily, is put for subjecting them to an oppressive service.

10. Hypocatastases in the use of laying to heart, for considering. "And thou saidst, I shall be a mistress for ever, so that thou didst not lay these things to thy heart. Thou didst not remember the end of it," vs. 7. And that cruelty to the captive Israelites on the one side, and this pride and inconsideration on the other, which are a virtual denial of Jehovah's dominion over her, were the reasons that he was to inflict on her the retribution he foreshows.

11, 12, 13, 14. Hypocatastases. "Now, therefore, hear this, O voluptuous one, that sittest in security, that sayest in thine heart, I am, and none besides me, I shall not sit a widow; I shall not know the loss of children. Yet they shall come to thee suddenly; in one day, the loss of children and widowhood: they shall come upon thee in their perfection; in the multitude of thy sorceries, in the abundance of thine enchantments," vs. 8, 9. The loss of children and husband, is put for the loss of those most intimately connected with her, and essential to her happiness, as the metropolis of the empire; namely, her subjects in the other cities, and in the provinces; and these calamities were to come in the midst of her sorceries and enchantments, in her faith in which she was to the last moment to believe she had a knowledge of the future, and be confident of safety from her enemies. This prediction was verified at the capture of the city by Cyrus. The population continued in the persuasion that they were safe till the Persians had entered the city, and the transition from power to subjugation, from honor to disgrace, was instantaneous.

"And thou wast secure in thy wickedness. Thou hast said, there is no one seeing me. Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, it has seduced thee, and thou hast said in thy

heart, I am, and there is no other," vs. 10. Her very wickedness was the ground of her confidence. She denied that there was any superior being who witnessed her conduct, and would hold her responsible for it. Her wisdom, her skill in soothsaying, probably seduced her into that self-deification. She said in her heart, "I am;" that is, I exist by myself, and am all-wise and all-powerful. There is no other of these attributes. I am a law, therefore, to myself, and am sure of impunity. But this infatuation was to lead to her overthrow.

15, 16. Metaphors in the use of fall and crash to denote the resistlessness of the power by which she was to be overthrown. "And so there cometh upon thee evil, against which thou hast no charm; and there shall fall upon thee ruin: thou shalt not be able to avert it. And there shall come upon thee suddenly a crash, which thou shalt not know," vs. 11. The evil was to descend on her like a thunderbolt from heaven. She was to be struck down from her power—not by a long series of slow-working influences,

17. Comparison. "Behold they are like stubble; fire has burned them. They cannot deliver themselves from the hand of the flame. There is not a coal to warm one's self, a fire to sit before," vs. 14. They were to be to the sword of the Persians what stubble is to fire, and be immediately and utterly destroyed. That there "is not a coal to warm one's self—a fire to sit before," seems to denote the absoluteness of their destruction. Like stubble given to the fire, they were to be swept from the scene, and not a trace of their order remain. As they were intimately connected with the court, and from their sway over the superstitious multitude, may have been regarded with distrust by the conquerors, it may have happened very naturally that they were slaughtered with the monarch and his attendants in the night of the conquest and sack of the city by the Persians.

"Thus shall they be unto thee with whom thou hast labored. Thy dealers from thy youth shall wander, every one to his own quarter. None shall save thee," vs. 15. Her soothsayers and enchanters, with whom she had wrought to gain a knowledge of the future, and protect herself by spells and charms, were thus utterly to fail her. Her dealers or merchants from her youth, who supplied her with their merchandise, or purchased the products of her arts, were to disperse every one to his home in the neighboring provinces or cities. She was no longer to be the luxurious capital of a great empire; none were to save her from the loss of her power and rank.

Chapter xlviii. God now summons the Israelites to listen to the reasons that he had thus foreshown the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, and their restoration from captivity. It was that he might furnish them with proofs of his foreknowledge, his control of all things, and his righteousness; and preclude them from ascribing those great events, when they should take place, to their idols, vs. 1–8. He was to spare and deliver them, wholly for his own name's sake, not for any merit of theirs, vs. 9–11. He calls them again to hearken to him, and affirms that his predictions in respect to Cyrus and Babylon shall be accomplished, vs. 12–15. He reminds them of the clearness with which he had spoken, proclaims himself their God and Redeemer, and laments that they had forfeited the blessings with which they would

have been crowned had they kept his commandments, vs. 16–19. And finally he summons them to return from Babylon, and promises to provide for their passage across the desert, but proclaims that no peace is ever to be enjoyed by the wicked, vs. 20–22.

1. Apostrophe.—"Hear this, O house of Jacob; those called by the name of Israel; and from the waters of Judah they have come out; those swearing by the name of Jehovah, and of the God of Israel they make mention—but not in truth, and not in righteousness," vs. 1.

2. Metonymy in the use of house for the family of Jacob.

3. Elliptical metaphor in the use of waters, in the sense of fountain, for the stock or lineage of Judah.

This description of the nation exhibits them as only in name God's people; their professions of allegiance to him were hypocritical; they were in reality the votaries only of idols.

"For from the holy city they are called; and upon the God of Israel they rely; Jehovah of hosts is his name," vs. 2; not Bel, Nebo, Moloch, or any of the other idol-gods

before it comes. I have let thee hear, lest thou say, My idol did them; my graven image and my molten image commanded them," vs. 4, 5. An awful picture of their insensibility to God's attributes and dominion. Such was their blindness to him, and their infatuated faith in their idols, that had he not foreshown ages before these great and seemingly improbable events, which none but an all-seeing and all-controlling being could foreknow, the Israelites would have ascribed the raising up of Cyrus, the conquest of Babylon, and their restoration from captivity, which was a consequence of it, to their idols; and the terrible judgments with which the nation was smitten in punishment of their apostasy to Baal, Astaroth, and Moloch, would have been the means of confirming them in their idolatry, instead of recalling them from it. But he forced on them by these predictions and their accomplishment, the most resistless proofs of his perfect knowledge, his truth, and his all-controlling sway.

"Thou hast heard. See all of it (accomplished). And ye, will not ye declare it? I have made thee to hear new things from this time, and hidden things, and thou didst not know them. They are created now and not of old; before to-day thou hast never heard them lest thou shouldst say, Behold I knew them," vs. 6, 7. They were events that no human eye could foresee. They were of a nature so extraordinary that no human judgment could anticipate them as probable. None but a being of infinite knowledge and power, and the maker, upholder, and ruler of the world, could bring them into existence. For their taking place depended on the continuance of the earth for a series of ages, the creation of a succession of human generations, the direction of their agency, and millions of other acts and events to the production of which none but the Almighty creator and disposer of all things is adequate.

"Nay, thou didst not hear; nay, thou didst not know. Likewise, before, thine ear was not opened. I knew thou wouldst act very treacherously; and an apostate thou wast called from the womb," vs. 8. They not only had no natural foresight of those events nor intimation of their futurity from their idols, but they did not even believe God's prediction of them till they were taking place. They did not listen when he foretold them;

their ears remained closed against his voice; they acted the same faithless and rebellious part in regard to these, as all his other threatenings and promises. His sparing them was, accordingly, to be from pure mercy, and to shelter his name from dishonor.

7. Hypocatastasis in the use of cut off, for putting to death. "For my name's sake, I will defer my anger, and for my praise will I restrain it towards thee, so as not to cut thee off," vs. 9.

8. Metaphor in denominating afflictions a furnace. "Behold I have tried thee, and not with silver. I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction. For my own sake, for my own sake will I do it. For how will it be profaned? and my glory I will not give to another," vs. 10, 11. To leave the Israelites, though so guilty, to be wholly destroyed, would greatly dishonor him, as it would involve the relinquishment of all his covenants with their forefathers and all his promises to them, and would yield a triumph to the false gods whose worshippers were the instruments of their de-

vs. 14. That is, who among the votaries of the false gods?

11. Hypocatastasis in the substitution of arm for person. "The Lord hath loved him (Israel, whom he is to save). He will do his pleasure on Babylon, and his arm shall be on the Chaldeans," vs. 14. That is, it is to be because of his own sovereign love to his people Israel, notwithstanding their rebellion, that he is to purify and redeem them. It will be by the execution of his own pleasure on Babylon that she will be destroyed, not the vengeance of the Israelites nor of the Persians. It will be his arm that will inflict the fatal blow on the Chaldeans, not the arm of Cyrus and his warriors; and because Israel was his chosen people.

12. Hypocatastasis in the use of way for condition. "I have spoken; I also have called him (Israel), and he makes his way prosperous," vs. 15. Israel's relations to God as a chosen people whom he had called into existence, and adopted as his in distinction from all other nations, were a sufficient reason for his thus delivering them. It was that his name, instead of being dishonored, might shine forth in its unclouded effulgence.

13. Apostrophe. "Come ye near to me. Hear this. From the beginning I have not spoken in secret. From the time of its being I was there. And now the Lord Jehovah hath sent me and his Spirit," vs. 16. This fresh summons of the Israelites to attention, and renewed declaration that he had ever been present and spoken openly when he had made revelations to them, and that (in the person of his Word) he was now sent of Jehovah, and his Spirit, was designed to impress them with the most distinct and emphatic realization that he was the giver of the pledges he had just uttered.

And this he enforces by announcing himself again as the self-existent, their covenant God and Redeemer, expressing his gracious dispositions towards them, and lamenting their loss, by their rebellion, of the blessings he had been ready to bestow on them.

14, 15, 16, 17. Comparisons of peace to a river, of righteousness to the waves of the sea, and of offspring to sand and gravel in number. "Thus saith Jehovah, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: I, Jehovah, thy God, am teaching thee to profit, leading thee in the way thou shalt go. O

that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments. Then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea. Thy seed, also, had been as the sand, and the offspring of thy bowels as the gravel. His name should not have been cut off nor destroyed from before me," vs. 17–19. They had not only drawn on themselves, by their rebellion, all the great calamities by which they had been smitten, but had debarred themselves from gifts far greater than those with which they had been distinguished in even their most prosperous days. Had they hearkened to God's commandments, their peace had been as a river—uninterrupted, a continuous current, carrying verdure, abundance, and joy wherever it flows. They would never have been carried into captivity; they would never have been conquered, their armies slain, their cities sacked, their land devastated; they would never have been assailed; they would never have been threatened by an enemy. What a stupendous influence is thus ascribed to their rebellion! It changed not only their whole history, but the history of all the surrounding nations and the world. For

a perfection which now is not to be known till the millennium. Their numbers, also, would have been countlessly increased. Christ, in his lament over Jerusalem, declared in like manner, that had she, instead of rejecting, received him as her king, she would have been taken under his protecting wings and delivered from the fearful judgments with which she was to be overwhelmed. That those transcendant blessings of peace, of sanctification, and of prosperity had not been bestowed on them, had not been from any indisposition on God's part. He had contemplated them, in his gracious purposes, as expressions of his love, but for their revolt to idols, which rendered the gift to them of such rewards of obedience impossible.

Yet their rebellion was not to prevent him from restoring them from the exile to which he, for a period, was to consign them, and displaying towards them the greatness of his power and love. "Go forth from Babylon. Flee ye from the Chaldees. With a voice of joy (a shout) tell this; cause it to be heard. Utter it even to the end of the earth. Say ye, Jehovah hath redeemed his servant Jacob. And they thirsted not in the deserts through which he made them go. Water from a well he made to flow for them. And he clave the rock and waters gushed out. There is no peace, saith Jehovah, to the wicked," vs. 20–22. This restoration, which is thus publicly and joyfully ascribed to Jehovah, is to be far more extensive than the first return from Babylon; as it is to be a redemption of Jacob, and include, therefore, the ten tribes whose "names" have for so many ages been "cut off." It is to have its verification, therefore, at the final regathering of the nation. This is confirmed by the predictions in other prophecies, as chap. xxxv. 6, 7; xli. 18; xliii. 19; that then streams are to be opened in the desert, and springs of water in the wilderness, that they may not thirst. That there is to be no peace to the wicked, not only denotes that revolt is infallibly followed by punishment, but implies that purification in the furnace of affliction and a restoration to allegiance are essential conditions of the blessings God is then to bestow on his true people.

The prophecies, chapter xl.–xlviii., form a group that treats of much the same themes, and that exemplifies the mode in which God pursues the great ends of his govern-

ment under the present dispensation; and from the large fulfilments they have received, indicate the principles on which the other predictions of Isaiah are to be interpreted. They commence with the announcement of a messenger summoning the nation to prepare for the coming of the Messiah; then his advent itself, his revelation of himself in glory, and his redemption of his people from their enemies, xl. 1 11. But these predictions were received with doubt and unbelief by the nation, partly from distrust of Jehovah's power to conquer their foes; and partly from a belief of the reality of the idol deities whom their enemies, and many of themselves, worshipped. A principal aim of the prophecies and expostulations of these chapters accordingly is, to confute that faith in images, as irrational, as a rejection of Jehovah, and as a barrier, while they continued in it, to their reception of the blessings he had promised them. And he endeavors to recall them from it, by exposing the senselessness of ascribing the attributes of Deity to a material image, the work of men's hands, and having nothing

they were not gods; and that trust in them was a delusion. And that is according to the usual course of his procedure with nations, with his own people, and with individuals, under the present dispensation. He does not, when great evils spring up, immediately interpose and put an end to them by a direct and resistless exertion of his omnipotence. He allows the questions between him and men to be determined by trials, in which the falsehoods they array against his truth, are allowed to confute themselves by a practical disclosure of their evil character and the fatal fruits which they naturally yield; while at the same time he is vindicated, and his righteousness, wisdom, and goodness, made to shine forth in their glory.

The great predicted events that were to be the test of this question were, first, a series that were to spring directly out of their faith in idols. First, their being conquered by the Chaldeans, and carried into captivity to their capital. Next, the rise of a prince in the east, named Cyrus, who was to be the instrument of God's vengeance on Babylon. Thirdly, his conquest of that city, because of her addiction to idols and cruelty to the Israelites held by her in bondage. Fourthly, his conquest of other nations and acquisition of the great treasures they had hoarded in their palaces. Fifthly, the restoration by his decree of the captive Israelites to their own land, and the re-erection of their temple. And next, another series of far greater significance, that were to spring from his gracious covenant with the Israelitish people. 1. The coming of the herald of the Messiah, who was to proclaim in the desert, "Prepare ye the way of Jehovah; make his paths straight," chap. xl. 2–4. 2. The coming of the Messiah himself, xl. 5, 9, 10; xlii. 1–7. 3. His working miracles for the healing of the diseased and relief of the suffering, xlii. 7. 4. The revelation of himself in his glory, and the recognition and joyful reception of him as Jehovah, their Redeemer, by Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, xl. 5, 9, 10. 5. The full and final restoration of Israel from their dispersions, and deliverance from all the calamities brought on them by their sins, xl. 1, 2; xliii. 1–28; xlv. 17. 6. The overthrow of all idolatrous nations and destruction of their deities, xlii. 1–15; xliv. 9–21. 7. The communication of the glad tidings of Messiah's reign to the Gen-

tiles and subjugation of the world to his sceptre, xlii. 6–16; xlv. 20–25.

Now a large share of these predictions have been literally accomplished: such as the captivity of the Israelites at Babylon; the rise of an eastern prince named Cyrus, and acquisition by conquest of a great empire; the conquest of Babylon by him in an unexpected and extraordinary manner, and subjection of its inhabitants to the condition of vassals and slaves of a foreign ruler; the restoration, in consequence of that overthrow of the Chaldean power, of the captive Israelites to their own land, and the rebuilding of their temple; the coming of the herald of the Messiah; the coming of the Messiah himself in a lowly form, exercising a ministry of meekness and gentleness on the one hand, and of divine authority and power on the other, xlii. 1–7; and the communication to the Gentiles of the blessings of his salvation, xlii. 4–6. And the events in which they had their accomplishment were identically those which these prophecies, taken in their simple grammatical sense, foreshow. And that has been the only fulfilment of them, that

by that and all the other cities of Judea as their God; that the whole race is to see him; that he is to reign over them as a shepherd over his flock, gathering the lambs in his arms and bearing them in his bosom, xl. 5–11; that he is then to complete the redemption of Israel from their dispersion and redeem them for ever from sin, xlii. 10–16; xliii. 1–7, 14–21, 25; xliv. 1–8, 21–23; and that at length all nations and every individual is to bend in submission to his sway, xlv. 22–25. For these events are as indubitably expressed by the language of these passages, taken in their grammatical sense, as the others are in the language in which they are foreshown. No pretext can be given for allegorizing these any more than for allegorizing those; nor is there any principle on which these can be treated as allegorical any more than those, without the rejection of their genuine sense, and violation of the laws of language.

And this must be regarded as an equal proof that, with the exception of the allegory, chapter v. 1–7, which is the only example of that figure in the book, all the other predictions of Isaiah have their prophetic exclusively in their grammatical sense. The attempt to convert them from simple language predictions into representative ones, on the principle of parables and symbols, is not only unauthorized, but is an attempt directly to set aside their genuine sense, and substitute a fictitious one in its place.

These prophecies show that the apostasy of the Israelites to which they refer, was essentially the same as that into which a large share of the Gentile church has fallen; and that the measures of God's procedure towards those ancient worshippers of idols, were much like those by which he now inflicts his vengeance on the modern adorers of images and creatures.

The ascription to mere material images wrought by men, of the attributes of self-existent and infinite intelligences and worship of them by sacrifices, adoration, prayer, and trust, is one of the most besotted and solecistical forms that human folly and impiety ever assumed. It is against the most indubitable testimony of the senses. It is against the clearest dictates of reason. It is against all the experience of those who seek by worship to draw signals from them of intelligence and power. Yet that faith was cherished with

an infatuated persistence by the Israelites for four hundred years, and by monarchs, princes, and priests, as well as the common people, against the direct remonstrances of God, the threats of avenging judgments, and the infliction of a long series of the most terrible calamities with which nations are ever overwhelmed; domestic and foreign wars, slaughters, oppressions, captivities, and famines.

The Gentile church has in like manner apostatized to the homage of idols and images held to be representatives of creatures, ascribed to them the attributes and prerogatives of Jehovah, and persisted in the deification and worship of them through fifteen centuries, against the clearest prohibitions by the Almighty and warnings of his retributive wrath, and in spite of a uniform experience of their uselessness and nothingness. God left the Israelites to go on for a long period in their false faith, and exemplify its natural effects in their principles and manners; and they sank under it to the lowest depths of social and national demoralization.

He has also left the Gentile worshippers of idols pro-

God on them is to be finished. It is on those who have the mark of the beast and its image, that the last plagues from the avenging vials are to be poured.

These wondrous measures of his providence are to issue in the vindication of his attributes and rights, and the eternal confutation and disgrace of the makers and worshippers of idols. He proclaimed to his ancient people, while the controversy in regard to idols was in progress, "They shall be ashamed and confounded all of them; they shall go to confusion together that are makers of idols: I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return; that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." And at the effusion of the last plagues on the apostate Gentile church, the hosts of the redeemed "sang the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name, as alone holy? For all nations shall come and worship before thee because thy judgments are made manifest."

Art. VII.—Literary and Critical Notices.

1. Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews, with an Introductory Essay on Civil Society and Government. By E. C. Wines, D.D., Professor of Greek in Washington College, Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: W. S. & A. Martien; London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1859.

This is a new and tasteful edition of Dr. Wines's Commentaries, a notice of which was given in the Journal soon after their first publication. They have become so widely known and are held in such estimation as to render it unnecessary that we should speak particularly of their high merits. We will only state, for the information of such of our readers as are not familiar with them, that they treat at large of all the important themes, a knowledge of which is necessary in order to a just and comprehensive view of the ancient Hebrew Scriptures, the

government the Most High instituted over the Israelites through the ministry of Moses, and the peculiar providence he exercised over them through a long series of generations; such as, first, the characteristics of Moses as a man and writer; his precedence, by many centuries, of all other historians whose works have come down to us; the contrast he presents, in simplicity, integrity, truthfulness, and dignity, to all other ancient writers; his Divine legation; his character as a leader and lawgiver; and the influence of the laws of the Pentateuch on the civilization of the world; and, next, the great features of the Hebrew government—on the side of God, as Lawgiver, King, and Providential Ruler, bestowing blessings and inflicting judgments in his sphere as God, not simply in that of mere human rulers—and on the side of the Hebrews in their being required voluntarily to accept his rule, and take a share, as individuals, as families, as village and city communities, as tribes, and as a people, in the places assigned them, in sustaining and executing the laws; in their being placed on an equality with each other in rights, in the distribution and tenure of the land, by which every family was made a possessor in perpetuity; in the organi-

of the New Testament, the collateral sources whence a knowledge of it is to be drawn, and the rules by which it is to be interpreted. The latter are but very general and vague; such as, that no sense is to be sought after except that which is clearly expressed by the language; that the language is to be taken in its ordinary established meaning; that figurative expressions are to be treated as figurative, not as untropical; and that parables are to be explained according to the simple and obvious analogies that subsist between them, and the things which they are employed to represent. These rules, however self-evident and authoritative, set aside, if adhered to, the whole system of spiritualization of which Dr. F. is an advocate. He next discusses a number of subjects presented in the New Testament, such as the genealogies, angels, Christ's titles, and other important items; and, thirdly, the quotations in the New, from the Old Testament. These are all themes of interest that are not often presented in volumes within the reach of any but professional readers. Inquirers of all classes will find them treated here with much learning, and in a simple and attractive style.

3. A Grammar of the New Testament Diction, intended as an Introduction to the Critical Study of the New Testament. By Dr. George B. Winer. Translated from the Sixth Enlarged and Improved Edition of the Original, by Edward Masson, A.M., formerly Professor in the University of Athens. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co.; New York: R. Carter & Brothers; Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

The publishers could scarcely render a more important service to the public than in issuing a new and tasteful edition of this work, the eminent excellence and classical authority of which render it essential to all critical students of the New Testament. The subjects embraced in this volume are the peculiarities of the New Testament diction, orthography, accentuation; the forms of nouns, adjectives, and verbs; and the syntax of the article, pronouns, nouns, and verbs. Its merits beyond other grammars are so well known as to render commendation of it unnecessary. The second volume, comprising the remainder of the work, is soon to appear.

4. The Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered: Being the Second Part of Theology, considered as a Science of

Positive Truth, both Inductive and Deductive. By R. J. Breckenridge, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Danville, Kentucky. New York: R. Carter & Brothers; Louisville: A. Davidson. 1859.

In his former volume Dr. Breckenridge treated of man as the subject of redemption; of God as its author; of the special offices in it of Christ and the Holy Spirit; and of the great measures or acts by which it is accomplished. In this he treats of redemption itself as a system of effects wrought by God in the redeemed: first, in the great principles on which he proceeds in it; next, in the great acts on individuals by which he makes them partakers of it, as effectual calling or regeneration, justification, sanctification, adoption; and thirdly, their special acts and affections towards him when thus restored to his image, such as faith, repentance, love, obedience. To this he adds a brief view of the church as a society, and of its ordinances.

It has the same lofty characteristics as the former volume—a vivid sense of the reality and grandeur of the truths he discusses, a keen analysis of the principles on which they rest, a brief and demonstrative presentation of their relations to God

he regards as nearly completed, is to meet its catastrophe at Christ's coming in the clouds, who is then to establish in its place his own kingdom in which he is to reign in person, with the risen and glorified saints, and continue the work of redemption through the ages of ages. The great outlines of the divine purposes, disclosed in those chapters, are unfolded with clearness and strength, confirmed by the numerous concurrent prophecies in the New Testament, vindicated from objection, and shown to be worthy of the wisdom, grace, and power of the Most High. The style is simple, and the reasonings scriptural and direct. We are heartily glad that Mr. Newton has not contented himself with addressing these truths to his people, but has presented them to the public. We regard it as an emphatic duty of pastors to proclaim them, and the natural, tasteful, and demonstrative form in which they are here set forth, unmixed with crude speculations, exempt from extravagances, cannot fail to invest them with interest to readers of all classes, and contribute to disarm prejudice and win assent.

6. The Great Concern; or, Man's Relation to God and a Future State. By Nehemiah Adams, D.D., Pastor of the Essex Street Church, Boston. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1859.

The author seems to have been prompted in his selection of topics by the mistaken opinions that prevail around him; as he employs himself not in stating merely and directly sustaining the great truths which he advances, but mainly in disentangling them from misrepresentation, and answering objections that are urged against them; and it is in this especially that he exhibits the excellent sense, the aptitude, and the fine tact with which the volume is eminently marked. His themes are: Instantaneous Conversion; Justification and its Consequences; Our Bible, the Inspired Word of God; Scriptural Argument for Future Endless Punishment; Reasonableness of Future Endless Punishment; God is Love; and they are treated with unusual sprightliness and vigor; the truth boldly and ably maintained, and the difficulties of the opposing errors unmasked with an adroit and powerful hand. The volume has a rare charm of ease, freshness, and tastefulness of illustration and point. There are no prolix disquisitions, no intricate trains of reasoning; all is

simple, vivacious, and transparent, carrying conviction to the understanding, and engaging the interest of the affections.

7. Sketches of Virginia: Historical and Biographical. By the Rev. William Henry Foot, D.D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Romney, Virginia. Philadelphia: W. S. Martien.

Though this volume was issued several years ago, the charm of its narratives of exciting events in the early history of Virginia, and delineations of the illustrious men who adorned the Presbyterian church in that colony for a long period, does not pass away. Scarce too high an estimate can be formed of the service Dr. Foot has rendered in gathering these memorials of those who planted the first Presbyterian churches in Virginia, and nurtured and sustained them amidst the difficulties of their first hundred years. A group of men distinguished by higher endowments and nobler characters could nowhere be found, nor one whose ministry was signalized by more decisive tokens of the divine favor.

The sketches commence in 1688, and give the chief incidents

The Memoir with which the volume opens will be very grateful to the numerous friends of Dr. Tyler. Though not of brilliant powers, yet of social and generous dispositions, frank, honest, laborious, and devoted to the interests of religion, he won the respect and affection of those who knew him, as a sincere and earnest disciple of Christ, and a well-furnished, diligent, and useful minister of his word. In the first scene of his labors, a parish in Connecticut, he was highly successful. After a pastorate of fourteen years he was appointed President of Dartmouth College, and filled that office from 1822 to 1828. He was then called to the charge of the church in Portland of which Dr. Payson had been pastor; and continued there till his election, in 1833, as Professor of Theology in the Theological Institute of Connecticut, where he remained till his death in 1858, in his seventy-fifth year.

The Lectures are a selection, obviously, from the series he was accustomed to deliver, as they are confined to the subjects that were in controversy between him and the New Haven party: The Original Character of Man, The Fall, Depravity, Decrees, Moral Agency, Regeneration; and they are highly creditable to him as a theologian and a Christian. The disquisitions of his opponents were animated, in an extreme degree, by the spirit of the gladiator—haughty, insolent, bent on victory, unscrupulous in endeavors to embarrass opponents, and often as irreverent towards God as unjust to men. Dr. Tyler's Lectures, undebased by that odious element, are calm, impartial, independent, truth-loving, aiming to reach and establish just views of the subjects of which they treat. They have not the marks, indeed, of a lofty and inventive genius, nor are they clad in the drapery of a gorgeous rhetoric. They are simple, unpretentious, and employed in maintaining the views that are generally held by the ablest orthodox ministers of the Congregational church; but they are clear, earnest, honest, dignified, and, in the main, indubitably on the side of truth, and entitle him to an honorable place among the leading writers on those subjects in New England—Edwards, Bellamy, Smalley, Dwight, Woods, Griffin, Day.

9. The Mothers of the Bible. By Mrs. S. G. Ashton. With an Introductory Essay, by Rev. A. L. Stone. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1859.

These brief sketches of the life and character of the mothers

of whom there is a record in the Bible, are written with discrimination and taste, and exhibit the views and sentiments—recognitions of God's all-directing sway; of the bitter fruits that spring from sin; of the office of the trials with which life is filled; of the faithfulness with which God verifies his promises to his children; the supports with which he sustains, and the victories with which he at length crowns them—that are appropriate to the themes.

10. The Types of Genesis, as Revealing the Development of Human Nature in the World, Within and Without, and in the Dispensations. By Andrew Jukes. London: Longman & Co. 1858.

Mr. Jukes maintains that the acts of God in the natural world, and the events that spring from them, are types of analogous acts and events in the spiritual world; and it is the aim of his volume to draw a parallel between the creation of the earth and man, and the renovation of the mind by the Spirit, and to show that Adam, Cain, Abel, Noah, Abraham, and others, are types, in their experiences and characters, of the experiences and cha-

visited with a promise and a gift—a promise that, weak as he is, the seed of the woman shall at length prevail—a gift by which, naked as he is, his nakedness may be covered. All that can be said of mere human nature—of man as man—is set forth in the history of poor, fallen, yet pitied and redeemed Adam. Soon we have another stage, or picture. In Adam's sons, the elder and younger, a type is given us of the two seeds, the flesh and spirit, the natural and spiritual, which have grown, by nature or by grace, out of the root of old Adam. That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural. Both are seen here in all their main outlines. Then comes Noah, who is more than the spiritual man; for there may be spiritual men who have not passed the mystic waters. Noah is the type of the regenerate—of those who know what it is to be taken out of one world and placed in another. His seed show us all the works which may be and have been wrought by those who are regenerate. Then Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph set forth those four great forms of life which are known and enjoyed after regeneration has been fully reached by us: Abraham being the life of faith, showing how the man of faith goes forth, not knowing whither, yet seeking to go to Canaan; Isaac revealing the life of sonship in the land, dwelling by wells of water, with many joys and few conflicts; Jacob the life of service, begotten on resurrection ground, and going down into the far country, to win a bride and flocks whom he may bring back to share his joy in heavenly places; Joseph, the last, most perfect life, the life of suffering, which first dreams of rule, and ends with all things brought into subjection to it."—*Preface.*

He admits that he has no express authority in the Divine word for this assumption.

"But is this all mere imagination? What proof have we that there is anything but fancy to support all this? I am not careful to answer this; first, because I write for those, who though requiring help, fully believe that some such events are treasured here; and also because the spiritual sense is its own proof, as a key by opening a complicated lock, sufficiently proves that it has been designed for it; a proof indeed which requires some capacity in the observer, and some exercise and intelligence in the things of God, but which will, I am assured, be increasingly satisfactory to those who will test it in the daily study and meditation of the word of God.

"Do I then despise the letter? God forbid. With sincerest faith I receive it, and thank God for it throughout Scripture. . . .

"But holding this, I see much more—that while the letter is a guide for things on earth, in spirit it veils and yet reveals to us the things of heaven; in this like the world around us, which while supplying means for this life, in those very supplies sets before the opened eye the secrets and treasures of the world within the veil; in this, too, like the Lord coming under our hands in human form, under that lowly form veiling yet revealing the glory of the eternal Son."—*Preface.*

His theory thus is, that the Scriptures present to us a double revelation; one embodied directly in their language taken in its ordinary grammatical sense; the other conveyed through the agents, objects, acts, and events, named and narrated in that language as representatives of others in the spiritual world.

This, which is substantially the doctrine of Origen and Swedenborg, is unauthorised, and is fraught, as the history of the church for fifteen centuries sadly shows, with the perversion and overthrow of the word of God.

In the first place, were such a veiled secondary revelation couched in the Scriptures, its existence would undoubtedly be directly made known to us, and the study and acceptance of it enjoined. It is not credible that such a vast series of commu-

or disobedience was to carry life or death to his posterity; as the obedience of Christ in that relation carries corporeal life to all the posterity of Adam, by a resurrection to those who die, and by a change to immortal to those who do not die. In like manner, the animals that were appointed to be offered in sacrifice were types of Christ, whose sacrifice theirs represented, not by virtue simply of their being animals; as, then, all animals of those species would be types of him, whether slain or not, and whether living antecedently to or subsequently to his crucifixion; but by their being appointed by God to be offered as representatives of Christ in his expiatory death. But God did not in the creation of the world act as an appointed type of himself. The supposition is absurd and solecistical. For it would imply that he represented himself as to act again in the creation of other material worlds of the same kind as the earth and the other bodies of our system—not as Mr. Jukes imagines—as to act as a Creator in a spiritual instead of a material or natural sphere. For Adam was a type of Christ simply as the head of the race, not in any other relation; the priests of the ancient ritual were types of Christ simply as priests, whose office it was to offer sacrifices and make intercession for men, not in any other sphere; and sacrificial animals were types of Christ simply as sacrifices for sin. If God, then, as the creator of our earth and heavens, was a type of himself, it must have been simply as the creator of such worlds and heavens as those of our solar system. Mr. Jukes's theory therefore defeats itself, inasmuch as it precludes God as the creator of the material world from typifying himself as the new creator in the renovation of the mind in the spiritual world.

In the third place, as the supposition that Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, Seth and Enoch, Lamech and Noah, Abraham and Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, and others who are mentioned in Genesis, were types, is a supposition that they were *appointed* to act as such; it implies, on the one hand, that all the spheres and agencies in which they acted were obligatory on them; and on the other, that those whom they typified were to act in identically the same spheres and relations, and exert the same kind of actions. But whom did Eve typify in her yielding to the guile of the serpent, eating the forbidden fruit, and persuading her husband to eat it? Has any other mother in our world stood in the same relation to a husband, and a posterity, and occasioned their fall, and in precisely the same manner? Whom did Abel typify in being slain? Has the second son of the

mother of another human race been put to death by his first brother as he was? Whom did Enoch typify in his translation to heaven? Whom did Noah and his family represent in their escape from the deluge by the ark? Has there been another universal deluge here by which another human race was destroyed, with the exception of precisely such a family? The theory thus carries on its front the proof of its falsehood; as it supposes our world to have been the theatre of another set of human actors, agencies, and occurrences of exactly the same nature as those recorded in Genesis, which we know has not, and cannot have been the fact.

In the fourth place. As the supposition that God appointed these persons to their offices and agencies as types, is a supposition that their agency as types is in obedience to his will, it implies that he sanctions and approves all the sins and follies of which they were guilty, and impeaches therefore his righteousness and truth, and overturns his government. For it exhibits him as instituting two directly opposite systems of legislation; commanding in one what in the other he prohibits, and prohibiting what in the other he commands. If Eve acted as a type in eating the forbidden fruit, and Cain in killing his brother,

instrument with which it was inflicted, a type of all other material things with which blows are stricken. There are thousands of truths that are exemplified in the persons, acts, and occurrences that are embodied in the narratives of Genesis; but that exemplification is not peculiar to them; it is common to all other persons and events of all other ages; and Mr. Jukes might, with as much propriety, treat all other human beings and actions of which he has a knowledge as types, and undertake to deduce from them a "veiled" revelation, as to assign that office to the personages and actions of Genesis and the other Scriptures, and affect to detect in them a representative revelation of the things of the Spirit.

11. The Life of John Milton, narrated in connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Times. By David Masson, M.A., Professor of English Literature in University College, London. With Portraits and Specimens of his Handwriting at different times. Vol. I., 1608–1639. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1859.

This volume traces the history of the poet to his visit at Rome in his thirty-first year, and invests it in a high degree with the interest and beauty in which it is enshrined in the hearts of those —the millions that speak the English language—to whom he is the object of admiration. Mr. Masson appears to have searched with the utmost thoroughness all the sources of information in regard to his childhood, youth, and first mature years, and has lighted up his narrative with sketches of all the important cotemporaneous events in the political, religious, and literary world, graphic pictures of the chief personages of the time, and incidents and anecdotes of interest.

12. Old South Chapel Prayer Meeting; its Origin and History. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1859.

This history extends over near twenty years, but is devoted chiefly to 1858 and 1859, and details many instances of conversion and other incidents of interest.

13. Lectures on Metaphysics. By Sir William Hamilton,

Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Edited by the Rev. Henry L. Mansel, B.D., Oxford, and John Veitch, M.A., Edinburgh. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1859.

We have only space in the present number to announce this volume. The review we propose of it we reserve to our next.

14. A New History of the Conquest of Mexico, in which Las Casas' Denunciations of the Popular Historians of that War are fully vindicated. By Robert Anderson Wilson, Counsellor at Law, author of "Mexico and its Religion," etc. Philadelphia: Challen & Son, J. B. Lippincott & Co., Lindsay & Blakiston; New York: Sheldon & Co; Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1859.

Of this volume, which we can only announce, a notice will appear in our next number.

fallen, and signals of the returning favor of God, in the influence of the Spirit, Dr. Wines delineates the Conversation that becomes the Gospel of Christ, and closes with admonitions and counsels that leave a grateful impression of his character as a pastor, and of the intelligence and piety of the church.

16. Prevailing Prayer, by the Rev. Edward Winthrop, New York Prot. Epis. Soc. for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge. 1859.

This brief treatise presents the leading characteristics of effectual prayer with a truthfulness, earnestness, and point, that render it highly suitable for distribution as a tract.

17. The British Periodicals. Republished by L. Scott & Co.

The Edinburgh and London for July, and Blackwood for August, have each an article on the Defences of Great Britain that proceeds on the apprehension that a war may ere long take place with France, in which Napoleon will attempt to invade England. The most undoubting convictions are expressed by Blackwood and the London that that event is at hand; and the writer in the London, an officer, it is said, of high rank in the army, aims to prove that unless the English greatly strengthen their fleet, fortify far more effectually their naval posts, and train a volunteer army of one or two hundred thousand, who may be instantly summoned into service when the exigency arrives, the French may easily succeed in the undertaking. These representations are undoubtedly colored in a considerable degree, for the purpose of rousing the nation to a preparation for such a conflict; but they bespeak a general and deep conviction in the minds of all parties that the Emperor of France is contemplating a revenge for the humiliation of Waterloo by a struggle with the English on their own soil; and that it may happen, and prove successful, none can deem improbable who look at the antipathies of the two nations, and the avowed aims of Napoleon, on the one side, and on the other, to the revelation in the Apocalypse, that the kings of the ten kingdoms are to give their power to an imperial chief, who is to rise to the throne of the Western Roman empire, and unite with him in re-establishing the Catholic hierarchy in its ancient authority, and persecuting the witnesses who then utter a testimony for Jesus.

Besides those, they have other articles of interest. The chief in the Edinburgh are the Acropolis of Athens, Dr. Cureton's Syriac Gospels, and Brialmont's Life of Wellington.

The London has highly tasteful essays on the Life of Erasmus, the Annals of Life Assurance, and the Islands of the Pacific.

The best in the Westminster are on Jowett, whom the writer regards as in a large degree an auxiliary in the war on the doctrines of redemption, while he dissents from some of his views; the Government of India, the Roman Question, and Austrian Interventions.

The chief themes of the North British are Guizot's Memoirs, Syriac Church History, Glaciers, Botany, and Napoleonism in Italy. Tennyson's Idyls of the King are very far from receiving high commendation. The theme is without interest. There is a total absence of great thoughts and fresh and lofty sentiments. The only merit lies in an unusual delicacy and brilliancy of imagery and charm of diction; and they are quite inadequate to give dignity to what is intrinsically mean, or garnish what is hideous and revolting.

ERRATA, No. XLV., IN ARTICLE V.

Page 133, second line from the bottom—for organization, read origination.
" 140, twentieth line from the bottom—for plan, read place.
" 146, fourth line from the top—for quick, read quiet.
" 148, twentieth line from the top—for troubles, read troubler.

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME XII. JANUARY, 1860. NUMBER III.

ART. I.—DR. MANSEL'S LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

THE LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT Examined in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1858, on the Bampton Foundation. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B.D., Reader on Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalen College. First American from the third London Edition, with the notes translated. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1859.

THE aim of the author in these lectures is, to confute those speculatists who treat religion as a philosophy, the problems of which are to be determined either wholly or in a measure by the mere powers of reason. They are of two classes. The Dogmatists who, accepting the great truths of revelation, "attempt to build up a complete scheme of theological doctrine out of the unsystematic materials furnished by Scripture, partly by the more complete development of certain leading ideas; partly by extending the apparent import of the revelation to ground which it does not avowedly occupy, and attempting by inference and *analogy to* solve problems, which the sacred

volume may indeed suggest, but which it does not directly answer." And the Rationalists who, claiming the power of determining *à priori* all philosophical and theological truth, construct a system irrespective of revelation, and reject or attempt to modify whatever the Scriptures present that is at variance with it. "Commencing with a preconceived theory of the purpose of revelation and the form which it ought to assume, it proceeds to remove or reduce all that will not harmonize with this leading idea; sometimes explaining away in the interpretation that which it accepts as given in the letter; sometimes denying on *à priori* ground the genuineness of this or that portion of the sacred text; sometimes pretending to distinguish between the several purposes of revelation itself, and to determine what portions are intended to convey the elements of an absolute religion, valid in all countries and for all ages; and what must be regarded as relative and accidental features of the divine plan." This school, the followers of Kant, Schelling, Hegel, and others of their train, and more properly denominated pantheists than rationalists, maintain that reason

each of which in its exclusive employment leads to errors so fatal, yet each of which, in its utmost error, is but a truth abused? If we may not, with the Dogmatist, force Philosophy into unnatural union with Revelation, nor yet with the Rationalist, mutilate Revelation to make it agree with Philosophy, what guide can we find to point out the safe middle course? What common element of both systems can be employed to mediate between them? It is obvious that no such element can be found by the mere contemplation of the objects on which religous thought is exercised. *We can adequately criticise that only which we know as a whole.* The objects of Natural Religion are known to us in and by the ideas we can form of them; and those ideas do not of themselves constitute a whole, apart from the remaining phenomena of consciousness. We must not examine them by themselves alone; we must look to their origin, their import, and their relation to the mind of which they are a part. Revealed Religion again is not by itself a distinct object of criticism; first, because it is but a part of a larger scheme; and, secondly, because Revelation implies an accommodation to the mental constitution of its human receiver, and we must know what that constitution is before we can pronounce how far the accommodation extends."—P. 60.

"There is one point from which all religious systems must start, and to which all must finally return; and which may therefore furnish a common ground on which to examine the principles and pretensions of all. *The primary and proper object of criticism is not Religion, natural or revealed, but the human mind in its relation to Religion.* If the Dogmatist and the Rationalist have heretofore contended as combatants, each beating the air in his own position, without being able to reach his adversary; if they have been prevented from taking up a common ground of controversy, because each repudiates the fundamental assumptions of the other; that common ground must be sought in another quarter, namely, in those laws and processes of the human mind by means of which both alike accept and elaborate their opposite systems. If human philosophy is not a direct guide to the attainment of religious truth (and its entire history too truly testifies that it is not) may it not serve as an indirect guide, by pointing out the limits of our faculties, and the conditions of their legitimate exercise?"—P. 61.

"If Revelation is a communication from an infinite to a finite intelligence, the conditions of a criticism of a Revelation on *philosophical grounds* must be identical with those which are

required for constructing a Philosophy of the Infinite. For Revelation can make known the Infinite Being only in one of two ways; by *presenting* him as he is, or by *representing* him under symbols more or less adequate. A presentative Revelation implies faculties in man which can receive the presentation; and such faculties will also furnish the conditions of constructing a philosophical theory of the object presented. If, on the other hand, Revelation is merely representative, the accuracy of the representation can only be ascertained by a knowledge of the object represented; and this again implies the possibility of a philosophy of the Infinite. Whatever impediments, therefore, exist to prevent the formation of such a philosophy, the same impediments must likewise prevent the accomplishment of a complete criticism of revelation. Whatever difficulties or contradictions are involved in the philosophical ideas of the Infinite, the same or similar ones must naturally be expected in the corresponding ideas which Revelation either exhibits or implies. And if an examination of the problems of Philosophy and the conditions of their solution should compel us to admit the existence of principles and modes of thought which must be accepted as true in practice, though they cannot be explained in theory;

withhold it from passing beyond its just limits, is undoubtedly highly important; but how is that to be accomplished, except by contemplating it in reference to the objects which it is to investigate, and discerning what parts of those objects lie altogether out of its scope, or in a measure transcend its powers? Many truths of both natural and revealed religion Mr. Mansel admits are at least largely within our grasp. Others, such as God's nature as a being, the ground of his self-existence, the mode of his tripersonality, are inaccessible to us. How, then, are these two classes to be discriminated from each other except by a consideration of them? They plainly cannot. And it is clearly as legitimate to look at the vastness and inaccessibleness of the divine nature to reach the conviction that it transcends our comprehension, as it is to deduce that feeling from the mere consideration of the narrowness and feebleness of our powers. What, moreover, is it to criticise natural and revealed religion? Not simply to endeavor to determine the absolute nature of all the objects to which it relates, or is held to relate, such as the being of God, the mode of his subsistence, and the nature of the soul as an entity, that lie beyond the scope of our powers; but also to ascertain the nature of those truths respecting God, his government, and ourselves, which confessedly lie in a measure within the sphere of our understanding; and the truth or error of the views also which men entertain in respect to them, and promulgate under the names of natural and revealed religion. And why are not these as proper subjects as any others of criticism: that is of impartial, earnest, and thorough investigation; not on *à priori* grounds of assumed or imagined reason, but by the inductive and deductive processes which we employ in other branches of knowledge, and in the wise use of all the powers with which God has endowed us, and of all the light he has vouchsafed us in his word and through his works? They undoubtedly are; and the propriety and necessity indeed of this sphere of criticism Mr. Mansel himself exemplifies. For what is the mode in which he criticises the human mind in order to show the narrow limits of its powers, and demonstrate its incompetence to frame a perfect system of theological truth? Not the direct inspection of the mind itself, as an entity, and measurement of its faculties; but instead the

consideration simply of the false and self-subversive conclusions which it reaches in some of its speculations: that is, it is by the criticism of the theological systems which it frames under the supposed guidance of reason, not the immediate analysis of its powers themselves, that he proves its inadequacy to evolve by its own energies a perfect system of religious truth.

The great subjects of natural and revealed religion, as far as they lie within the sphere of our knowledge, are undoubtedly as legitimate objects of inquiry, induction, judgment, and proof, as any others. What the necessary limits of our knowledge, however, are; what subjects transcend our faculties; what the proper methods are of investigation and proof, are questions of great moment; and we wish Mr. Mansel, with his keen powers and varied learning, had pursued them more directly and largely. He would have escaped serious inaccuracies and fatal errors in which he seems to us to have involved himself, and accomplished far more effectively the end at which he chiefly aims—the overthrow of the dreamy fabrics which modern rationalism has

in the third; or of an intelligent being possessing some one or more modes of consciousness in an infinite degree, but devoid of others. Even if it be granted, which is not the case, that such a partial infinite may, without contradiction, be conceived, still it will have a relative infinity only, and be altogether incompatible with the idea of the Absolute. The line limited in breadth is thereby necessarily related to the space that limits it; *the intelligence endowed with a limited number of attributes coexists with others which are thereby related to it, as cognate or opposite modes of consciousness. The metaphysical representation of the Deity, as absolute and infinite, must necessarily, as the profoundest metaphysicians have acknowledged, amount to nothing less than the sum of all reality.* 'What kind of an Absolute Being is that,' says Hegel, 'which does not contain in itself all that is actual, even evil included?' *We may repudiate the conclusion with indignation; but the reasoning is unassailable. If the Absolute and Infinite is the object of human conception at all, this, and none other, is the conception required. That which is conceived as Absolute and Infinite, must be conceived as containing within itself the sum, not only of all actual, but of all possible modes of being. For if any actual mode can be denied of it, it is related to that mode, and limited by it;* and if any possible mode can be denied of it, it is capable of becoming more than it now is, and such a capability is a limitation. Indeed it is obvious, that *the entire distinction between the possible and the actual can have no existence as regards the absolutely infinite*, for an unrealized possibility is necessarily a relation and a limit. The scholastic saying, *Deus est actus purus*, ridiculed as it has been by modern critics, is in truth but the expression, in technical language, of the almost unanimous voice of philosophy, both in earlier and later times.

"But these three conceptions, the Cause, the Absolute, and the Infinite, all equally indispensable, do they not imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same being? A Cause cannot as such be Absolute; the Absolute cannot as such be a Cause. The Cause as such exists only in relation to its effect; the Cause is a cause of the effect, the effect is an effect of the Cause. On the other hand, the conception of the Absolute implies a possible existence out of all relation. We attempt to escape this apparent contradiction, by introducing the idea of succession in time. The Absolute exists first by itself, and afterwards becomes a Cause. But here we are checked by a third conception, that of the Infinite. How

can the Infinite become that which it was not from the first? If causation was a possible mode of existence, that which exists without causing is not infinite; that which becomes a cause has passed beyond its former limits. Creation at any particular moment of time being thus inconceivable, the philosopher is reduced to the alternative of Pantheism, which pronounces the effect to be mere appearance, and merges all real existence in the cause."—Pp. 75–77.

"The last resource of Rationalism is to take refuge in that which, with reference to the highest idea of God, is speculative Atheism, and *to deny that the Infinite exists at all.* And it must be admitted that, so long as we confine ourselves to one side only of the problem, that of the inconceivability of the Infinite, this is the only position logically tenable by those who would make man's power of thought the exact measure of his duty of belief. For the infinite, as inconceivable, is necessarily shown to be non-existent; unless we renounce the claim of reason to supreme authority in matters of faith, by admitting that it is our duty to believe what we are altogether unable to comprehend. But the logical advantage of the atheistic alternative vanishes as soon as we view the question from the other side,

ception of the Absolute and Infinite, from whatever side we view it, appears encompassed with contradictions. There is a contradiction in supposing such an object to exist, whether alone, or in conjunction with others; and there is a contradiction in supposing it not to exist. There is a contradiction in conceiving it as one; and there is a contradiction in conceiving it as many. There is a contradiction in conceiving it as personal; and there is a contradiction in conceiving it as impersonal. It cannot without contradiction be represented as active; nor without equal contradiction be represented as inactive. It cannot be conceived as the sum of all existence; nor yet can it be conceived as a part only of that sum. A contradiction thus thoroughgoing, while it sufficiently shows the impotence of human reason as an *à priori* judge of all truth, yet is not in itself inconsistent with any form of religious belief. For it tells with equal force against all belief, and all unbelief, and therefore necessitates the conclusion that belief cannot be determined solely by reason."—Pp. 83–85.

He thus gives his assent to the postulates and reasonings of the Rationalists as the genuine intuitions and decisions of reason, maintains that the conclusions to which that faculty is naturally and necessarily borne are wholly self-subversive, and in irreconcilable contradiction to all the great truths of natural and revealed religion, and makes that the ground of his rejecting Rationalism as a system, and reason as a guide in theology. But to place his rejection of them on that ground is a fatal mistake.

It is to assume and represent that all the great facts and truths of religion, whether natural or revealed, are disproved to the eye of reason by invincible evidences, and that faith in them therefore is impossible. All truths are self-consistent and consistent with each other. To say, therefore, that propositions are self-subversive and contradictory to each other, is to say that they are false: and to say that the mind sees with indubitable certainty that they are self-subversive and contradictory to each other, is to say that it sees resistless proofs that they cannot be true; and what it sees by overwhelming proofs to be false, it cannot possibly accept and believe as true. We see with intuitive certainty that the numbers in the multiplication table bear those ratios to each other which that table expresses. Let

us, however, suppose another table framed, in which the cardinal numbers multiplied by each other were exhibited as yielding results implying that their ratios are essentially different, and that we thought we saw with equal certainty that those results expressed the truth, and thence subverted the principle of the first table. The consequence would be, not only that we could not believe either, but that we could no longer believe ourselves. The discovery of the unreliableness of our most indubitable intuitions would plunge us into universal uncertainty, and make faith in anything, no matter how self-evident, impossible. And so in the sphere of religion; if to the intuitive eye of reason, its facts and truths are indubitably self-subversive and contradictory to each other, they are to that eye as demonstratively false. If the doctrines, for example, that God is a self-existence, that he is infinite in his attributes, that he is unchangeable in nature and purposes, that he is the cause of all things, that he subsists in three persons, that the Word became incarnate, that he made expiation for our sins by his death, that men are justified by faith in him, are contrary to rea-

knowledge; and in the possession of that knowledge, because of its truthfulness and comprehensiveness, they bear the image of God. "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness has shined into our hearts, in order to the giving forth of the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. iv. 6. The knowledge, thus given, filling them with light, as the sun fills the atmosphere with its effulgence, is a knowledge of God's glory in the work of redemption. It is a discovery to them therefore of the reality, consistency, greatness, and beauty of God's attributes, as they are displayed in the work of redemption: a gift to them of a sight and sense of the grandeur of his perfections and ways that fills them with awe, wonder, and adoration. It reveals no self-contradictions therefore; it unveils nothing that does not command the assent of reason, and inspire reverential affections. That knowledge is accordingly the ground of their love and trust. They do not love and confide in God against their perceptions, or without reasons, but they love, adore, and trust, because they see him to be what he truly is: ineffably wise, ineffably holy, and ineffably good. To know God is accordingly everywhere exhibited as characteristic of the renewed, and the sure token of redemption. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 3. While not to know God is to be in revolt from him, and exposed to his wrath. For at the revelation of Jesus Christ from heaven, in flaming fire, those on whom he is to take vengeance, are those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with "everlasting destruction from his presence and the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. The knowledge of God communicated by the enlightening and new-creating Spirit, and by the word, in place of embodying self-contradictions and impossibilities that confound and stun the mind and drive it into a distrust alike of God and its own faculties, is thus the knowledge of him in the glory of attributes, acts, and works, that invest him with infinite majesty and beauty, and fill the recipient with awe, love, submission, and trust, and changes him, while he gazes on its effulgence, into the "same image from glory to glory by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. iii. 18.

It is contradictory also to the experience of God's children. They, instead of being repelled by the discoveries of him that are made to them in regeneration, and through the enlightening and quickening influences of the Spirit and impressions of the word that follow, are drawn to him and lost in wonder and adoration at the infinite beauty of his wisdom, his holiness, his goodness, his truth, his patience, his pity; they desire to rise to clearer views and a larger understanding of him, and look forward with joy to the hour when, raised to his presence and made like him, they shall see him as he is. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." 1 John iii. 2.

Into no greater or more unnatural error then could Mr. Mansel have fallen, than to assent to the rationalistic doctrine that to the eye of reason the great truths and facts of natural and revealed religion, bear on their front the stamp of falsehood, and repel and confound the mind, instead of commanding its assent.

solute and Infinite is an object of *human conception at all, this, and none other, is the conception required.* That which is conceived as absolute and infinite, *must be conceived* as containing within itself the sum, not only of *all actual, but of all possible modes of being.*" By the absolute and infinite is meant God simply; not the whole sum of existences, God and the dependent universe wholly distinct from him to which he has given being. It is a definition of God as a being, and is framed especially to express the theory of pantheism. And can a more false, a more senseless, or a more blasphemous delineation of him be conceived? It represents him as comprising in himself all that is actual, finite as well as infinite, created as well as self-existent, evil as well as good. It exhibits him accordingly as having in himself all the finite and imperfect natures of creatures and created things, whether intelligent, animal, or non-sentient; as having all the appetites, passions, and sensations of finite beings, whether intelligent or merely sentient; and all the affections of matter organized and unorganized; as the subject of all the functions and processes of the one, and all the modes of consciousness of the other, sinful as well as holy, indifferent and painful, as well as pleasurable. It identifies him therefore with the dependent and finite universe, or makes that a mere copy of him. It implies, accordingly, that he passes through all the modifications of being, of perception, of sensation, and of condition, of which they are the subjects; and among them, that he gives birth in himself to all orders and individuals of creatures that have existence in the created world, and in the modes in which they here come into life; that he has all their forms of thought, sensation, and volition; that he sins all the sins of his fallen creatures, feels all their remorse and despair, dies their deaths, and suffers and is to suffer their eternal perdition! What more self-contradictious and revolting conception ever entered the mind of man! What more impious undeification of God on the one hand, and deification of man and unintelligent nature on the other! We are astonished that Mr. Mansel could for a moment have yielded his assent to it.

1. But it is wholly unproved. No attempt is made to demonstrate it. None could have been made that would not have been *as gratuitous* and arbitrary as the definition

itself is: for it is self-contradictious in the postulate that a being that is infinite and perfect must comprise in himself all that is finite and imperfect; and in the assumption that God cannot give existence to any being, subsistence, attribute, relation, or event, exterior to himself, that does not already exist within himself, and in precisely the same form and condition. It not only is not possible to offer any proof or probability of the truth of that proposition, but it is not within the scope of the human mind to veil in any degree by the artifices of sophistry, the self-evident falsehood that is stamped on its front. We are conscious that we are dependent beings, not self-existent, and that we began our being recently, not infinite ages ago: and we see intuitively, that the being who created and upholds us, instead of resembling, must infinitely transcend us in nature, the mode of his existence, and the greatness and perfection of his attributes. Such is the instinctive feeling of every one who glances at the subject; such has been the conviction of men universally in all ages. To infer from our narrow and imperfect nature, as the pantheist does, that our Creator is exactly like us, is

knowledge is no obstacle to his being infinite in goodness; and his being infinite in those attributes, is no obstacle to his being infinite in righteousness, in justice, in truth, in mercy, in patience, and other perfections. They are perfectly consistent with each other, and are all naturally conceived as belonging to a being in whom any one of them exists.

4. One reason that it has been supposed solecistical to conceive of an infinite being in whom there are several different attributes that are also infinite, seems to be, that it is impossible to conceive of an infinite material subsistence in which there are different parts and dimensions, that are also separately infinite. But there is no analogy between the two. We cannot indeed conceive of a material subsistence that is not bounded: as we must conceive it in space. But the infiniteness or finiteness of a spirit and its attributes, has no relation to space. And all attributes, therefore, that are consistent with each other, may be predicated of the infinite Spirit without implying that many incompatible infinites are comprised in one.

5. There is no more inconsistency in conceiving of God, while infinite in his being, as infinite also in his attributes, than there is in conceiving of man as finite in his being, and yet as of many finite attributes. Finite attributes of intelligence, memory, imagination, goodness, will, power, are no more consistent with a finite spirit, than infinite intelligence, wisdom, goodness, justice, and power are with an infinite spirit.

6. It is a radical error in these rationalistic speculations, that they proceed on the assumption that God as a mere entity, is the proper object of theological knowledge, and that knowledge of his nature, as a spirit, is to be gained by the direct intuition of reason. No greater mistake could be made. God, as a mere subsistence, is not accessible to us. We have no perceptive powers by which we can directly discern him, and gain, by immediate inspection, a comprehension of his being. We can know him only indirectly, as he reveals and displays himself through his works, his acts, and his word; and theology properly treats only of him, his acts, and his will, as he manifests himself in those spheres.

7. That we have no knowledge of God's nature by direct inspection, but only know him from the revelations he makes of himself in his works, his word, and his providence, is no obstacle to our having a true knowledge of him and his moral government, and faith in his word, any more than our inability directly to discern the spirits of fellow-creatures is any obstacle to our having a true knowledge of them, faith in their reality, and assurance in regard to their good or evil dispositions. We are no more absolutely ignorant of God's nature, mode of subsistence, attributes, and manner of acting on existences exterior to himself, than we are of our own metaphysical nature, mode of subsistence, faculties, and method of acting on objects external to ourselves; and we are no more precluded from regarding God as infinite in his being and attributes because they lie out of the sphere of our direct perception, than we are precluded from affirming that our being and faculties are finite, because we have not seen our spirits with our eyes, and have no knowledge of their metaphysical nature.

8. There is no limitation to our knowledge of divine

ledge of divine things as confined within a narrow sphere, and as obstructed and baffled by seeming anomalies and self-contradictions, that, from the nature of our faculties, are irremediable to us, we have ample proofs that our powers admit of far greater and more comprehensive attainments than we now reach, and are capable indeed of a clear and exalted knowledge of every fact and truth in the whole compass of things—such as the character, the works, the will, the purposes of God, our relations and obligations to him, the nature of redemption, the glory of the ransomed kingdom he is rearing, its connexion with his unfallen worlds, the grandeur of his universal empire,—and kindred themes which are proper subjects of revelation. This is indicated by the variety, the vastness, the beauty, and the impressiveness of the manifestations he has made, and continually makes of himself in his works. The proofs he gives in his material, sentient, and moral worlds, of his being, power, intelligence, skill, goodness, righteousness, foresight, all-comprehensive purposes, and perpetual presence and activity, immeasurably surpass our comprehension, and show to us, from their countless multitude, their ceaseless repetition, their ineffable beauty, and their immeasurable grandeur, all the characters of an absolute infinitude. We may study them for ages, and can never exhaust them. Their excess beyond the grasp we have gained will only seem greater and greater in proportion as we advance in the knowledge of them. They are formed to give employment, and yield perpetually accumulating and exhaustless instruction through an immortal existence.

It is indicated by the greatness, the fulness, the variety, and the beauty of the revelations he has made of himself in his word. He has there made known to us his moral character; the aims with which he created, sustains, and governs the universe; the sway he first instituted over our world; the measures he has taken to restrain, reform, and redeem the race since its fall; his righteousness, his justice, his truth, his hatred of sin, his purpose to punish it; his love, his pity, his grace; the method of redemption he has chosen, the nature of the redemption itself he confers; the immortal life to which the saved are to be exalted; the reasons of the successive dispensations he has instituted; the principles on

which he conducts his providence; the effect of his administration over our world on his unfallen empire; the public revision, at a future time, of all his procedure with men, and their conduct towards him, and vindication of himself in the eyes of all his creatures; and a variety of subordinate and kindred themes, a knowledge of which is needful to our love, our adoration, our submission, our trust. The means of knowledge, the varied truths thus treasured up in the Scriptures, vastly transcend the measure of comprehension the most gifted and studious have ever yet attained. They may be searched into, traced in their relations, meditated and revolved, with the greatest concentration of powers, through the longest life, without being grasped in all their heights and depths; without exhausting the fulness of their meaning.

It is indicated very emphatically by the fact that we are susceptive of direct illumination by the Spirit of God in the knowledge of divine things; and of discoveries and revelations in respect to all subjects in regard to which God gives instruction to his children, immeasurably beyond those to

to God, and the nature and relations to him of his empire at large, that they may be instantly qualified to render perfect obedience in all their agency, and fill the lofty stations to which he advances them! And what disclosures and manifestations he must continue to make to them from age to age, to sustain them in obedience, and carry them on in a continual progress in wisdom, virtue, and blessedness, through an immortal existence!

Instead, then, of an inaptness in our faculties to truthful thoughts of God, such as rationalists affirm, it is clear that we are susceptive of vast and perpetually augmenting measures of knowledge respecting him and his kingdom; that he employs a great and almost boundless system of means to impart to us that knowledge; and that he actually elevates and is to elevate those whom he redeems, to a greatness and resplendence of vision and understanding that ineffably surpass the loftiest degrees of intelligence we reach in this life.

Mr. Mansel has thus mistaken the nature of the barriers that limit our knowledge of divine things. They do not lie in any inaptness of our faculties to receive the truths of natural and revealed religion, or any contradictoriness of those truths to our reason. No obstacle of that kind exists in us to the most comprehensive and perfect intelligence. The only limitations to our knowledge lie on the one hand in the sphere of the revelations that are made to us; God giving us instruction only on subjects—such as his existence, character, will, agency, works, purposes, our duty, our destiny,—the knowledge of which is needful to us in our present condition:—and, on the other, in our inability, from the finiteness of our faculties, to grasp so vast a sum of knowledge as he places in our reach through the medium of his works, his word, and the enlightening and elevating aids of his Spirit. Mr. M. has accordingly taken a wrong method of confuting those whom he opposes. Pantheism is not to be overthrown by admitting a share of the false postulates on which it founds its rejection of natural and revealed religion; but by confuting those arbitrary and irrational assumptions, and directly verifying the truth by its proper evidences. It is greatly to be regretted that Mr. Mansel took this course; as his volume is now likely to subserve the scheme he meant

to overthrow, and obstruct the cause of natural and revealed religion which it was his aim to promote.

Art. II.—Notes on Scripture.

Matthew xxiii. 13–xxiv. 32.

Matt. xxiii. 13–36. Our Lord's purpose in this address to the Scribes and Pharisees, it is probable, was twofold; to warn the Scribes and Pharisees themselves of their perilous condition, and to portray in the hearing of the people the true character of those whose authority, as the occupiers of the seat of Moses, he had just before recognised and prolonged. The latter, however, we may regard as the chief purpose; for he had already in a less public manner said to the Scribes and Pharisees nearly the same things (Luke xi. 37–54). On that occasion his language provoked a vehe-

his reply to the Pharisees and Sadducees, when they desired him to show them a sign from heaven. (See notes on Matt. xii. 38, and xvi. 1–4.) On another occasion he made the same intimation more publicly, as we learn from Luke xi. 29, 30, to which, as in some respects more explicit, we will turn. It may be paraphrased thus: "This is an evil generation" — a wicked race—"They seek a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it"—more than they already have in my miraculous works—"but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas" after being preserved three days and three nights in the body of the fish, and his wonderful deliverance therefrom, "was a sign unto the Ninevites" during forty days (Jonah i. 17, iii. 4), "so shall the Son of Man," after being preserved three days and three nights in the grave and his wonderful deliverance therefrom, "be a sign," during forty years, unto this generation.*

The personal history of Jonah considered as a type of our Lord's burial in the grave of Joseph, begins to be applicable at his resurrection. The deliverance of Jonah, which we doubt not was well known to the Ninevites, stamped his mission with Divine authority, and the deliverance of our Lord's body from the power of death and the grave (represented by the preservation of Jonah), was that further sign, which he foretold they should have. This sign or further proof, the apostles preached with great power (Acts i. 22, ii. 31, iv. 33, vii. 56), to that people during nearly forty years,—God confirming their testimony by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the mighty works they performed. Thus considered, this was the greatest of the signs given to the nation. It was a permanent or continuing sign, during the remainder of their national existence, and in this respect differed from the miracles which our Lord had previously performed.

However this may be, the event shows that God intended to spare the nation, such as it was, and its teachers and

---

* The forty *days'* respite in the case of Nineveh (Jonah iii. 4), it is supposed, typically or mystically represented the *years* of respite which were to be allowed to Jerusalem after our Lord's resurrection, or perhaps we should say after the commencement of our Lord's public ministry; inasmuch as the forty days, in the case of Nineveh, commenced with the beginning of Jonah's preaching.

rulers, depraved and wicked as they were, a little longer; peradventure they would yet repent, when they should have the further sign of the resurrection of Jesus, proved to them by evidence which they could not doubt, and preached to them and confirmed by signs and wonders wrought by the apostles. It was in the execution of this purpose (as we suppose), our Lord recognised and prolonged the authority of the Scribes and Pharisees, not for any good thing he saw either in the nation or in its teachers or rulers. We add a few observations upon some of these verses.

Verse 13. "But woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in."

This was the characteristic sin of the Scribes and Pharisees. They lived in times the like of which had never been before. The kingdom of God had been brought nigh (Matt. xi. 13. See note, and Luke xvi. 16). Their privileges and responsibilities were greater than those of their

a kind of form of that vice which was peculiar to their caste or class, as spiritual guides. It was their character and office which gave them access to their victims. The apostle Paul warned Timothy (1 Tim. vi. 5), against some in the church, even in his day, who regarded religion as a thing valuable only so far as it might be made subservient to lucre (see 2 Pet. ii. 1), and the history of the church, in all ages since, shows an uninterrupted succession of such teachers from the Scribes and Pharisees, whom the Lord thus severely condemned.

Verses 15–31. These verses cannot be made plainer by any comment.

They show how zealous these men were in propagating their (so called) religious scheme of doctrines, supported by the most absurd interpretations of the Scriptures, and how little influence their religious opinions had upon their moral and religious character. Punctilious as they were in the observation of small things, and imposing and beautiful as their exterior life appeared, they were, within, like sepulchres, full of rottenness and all uncleanness. Under pretext of being more holy than their fathers, and vainly disavowing their deeds, they were treading closely in their footsteps; and were at that moment meditating the commission of the most heaven-daring of the nation's crimes. Well knowing their character and their purposes, the Lord added:

Verse 32. "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers." Fill ye up, then, to the full, the measure of the divine forbearance towards your nation, which your fathers, in all their generations, have been filling.

This verse is to be regarded as permissive and predictive, not as an exhortation or command. As if the Saviour had said: "Seeing you are inflexibly bent upon putting me to death, and thus putting an end to your own existence as a nation, by the most atrocious of your sins, God will permit you to have your own way. But how, then, will it be possible for you to escape the severest punishment?"

The permission thus given to the Scribes and Pharisees, and through them to the nation itself, was indispensable to the accomplishment of their purpose of putting him to death. *No one, not the* whole nation, not Satan himself,

nor all together, had power to take the life of the Lord against his will, or without his permission (John x. 18). The time, the place, and the occasion concur to show that these words should be understood in this sense. They may remind us of the like permission soon afterwards given to Satan, as soon as he had taken corporeal possession of Judas Iscariot (John xiii. 27; see note in Journal, vol. vii. pp. 303–305).

Verse 33. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

The Saviour does not positively affirm that hell was their destination, and damnation their doom: for with God all things are possible; but, considered as a question, what other answer could they return to it? Yet, notwithstanding their extreme wickedness, they were to be spared, and borne with a little longer, and still further trial given them, as we have seen, in order that they might repent and believe, or display more fully their character, and the justice of God in their punishment. (See Rom. ix. 17.) The event of this further trial the Saviour foresaw and foretold for the

scribes," the apostles and other ministers of the word, whom he soon after sent forth to preach the gospel to the nation; who labored in their midst, till Jerusalem was destroyed, and the people dispersed by the Romans. The cruel treatment which he foretold they would receive, he had before predicted in the parable of the marriage (Matt. xxii. 6; see xxiv. 9; John xv. 20, xvi. 2), and Paul refers to it as a historical fact in his first epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 14–17), written (it is supposed) about nineteen years after this time. And if minute accounts of the persecutions of Christians during this last period of the Jewish State had been transmitted to us, we doubt not they would most abundantly verify this prediction of the Saviour in all its particulars. See note on Matt. xii. 43–45, Journ. vol. xi. 244, 5.)

But what is especially noticeable in this last denunciation is, that our Lord regards the Scribes and Pharisees both as individuals and as the representatives of the nation from its origin. Being the elect nation under the covenant, the people were dealt with as a corporate person, identically one and the same in all their generations. In this character and capacity, the privileges of the kingdom had been covenanted to the nation, and when forfeited, they were taken away from it as such. Upon the same principle, the guilt which former generations had incurred and accumulated was to be charged to the account of the last. The punishment which the Divine justice inflicted for the nation's sins thus considered (besides the national loss of the covenanted blessings), was the utter ruin of their commonwealth, and the subjection of the people to the power of the Gentiles: in other words temporal judgments; which only, the nation *as such* could suffer. But these included particular inflictions upon the people individually, more or less intense respectively, according to their ill-desert. This no doubt was very various, yet in none so great, that the punishment due to it could not be averted by repentance towards God and faith in their rejected Messiah. Many of the priests, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles (vi. 7), though they had been zealous and active enemies of Jesus, during his public ministry, afterwards became obedient to the faith; and the Pharisee, Saul of Tarsus, though he took an active part in fulfilling the prophecy (Acts vii. 58, viii. 1, xxvi.

10, 11; 1 Tim. i. 15, 16), is another example of the Divine clemency. That there was among this corrupt people an election of grace is proved by many places (Rom. xi. 4, 5; Acts xxi. 20), and it was no doubt in part for the sake of gathering these that the days of vengeance were postponed (see 2 Pet. iii. 9). But to return to the principal point of this passage.

Our Lord charged the nation not only with the blood of their own prophets, but with the guilt of all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel. In what sense, it may be inquired, could the nation be charged with crimes which neither they nor their fathers, from the time they were chosen as the elect nation, had committed? Mr. Alford remarks, "that the murder of Abel was the first in the strife between unrighteousness and holiness; and as the Jews now represent the murderers of the first, they must bear the vengeance of the whole in God's day of wrath." Without controverting the views of learned men upon obscure questions, the writer may be

which was, as we have seen, the postponement of the day of retribution. This reasoning is analogous to that employed in the note on Matt. ii. 17, 18, and Jer. xxxi. 15, to which the reader is referred.

It cannot be necessary to add, that the actual issues or events of God's covenant with Israel were foreseen (Acts xv. 19). They were not only foreseen, but actually provided for, in the scheme of redemption, which included all possible issues of each and every of its subordinate parts.

Having now done with the Scribes and Pharisees, our Lord closed his public ministry by an address to the nation. To enter at all into his conceptions the reader must consider with profound attention the time, the place, the occasion, the people addressed, their history, their relations to God by covenant, the consequences of their sinful rejection of the Lord Jesus to themselves as a nation and a race, and to the world. We call it an Apostrophe, and such it is. But so vast are the thoughts it expresses, so deep the emotions that prompted them, so comprehensive the appeal, and in all these respects, so far above the conceptions of the actual audience, that we may with equal propriety regard it as a Divine Soliloquy or the Lord's declaration to himself of his own faithfulness to his covenant engagements, and of his reasons for withdrawing the special care and providence he had hitherto extended to the nation. Let us attend to some of the particulars.

Verse 37. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem."

Many great and glorious purposes are connected with Jerusalem. The Saviour himself called it the city of the great king (Matt. v. 35; see Ps. xlviii. 2). God himself had chosen it (1 Kings xi. 13), and resolved to establish it (1 Kings xv. 4), and will dwell in the midst of it (Zech. viii. 3), and make it a rejoicing (2 Kings xxiii. 27), and a joy to the whole earth (Isaiah lxv. 18, 19). This purpose he will never abandon or change (Zech. i. 17, ii. 12). That a city of such exalted privileges, and so glorious a destiny, should madly cast them all away, or even momentarily disregard them, was a matter of profound astonishment and grief. This is intimated by the repetition. It is more to our purpose, *however, to observe,* that under this name, the Saviour

summons the whole nation, in all its generations, living and dead, before him, to hear these, his last words, as if he had said: "O my people, my people—my people by choice and covenant,—how often would I have gathered you," &c.

—— vs. 37. "that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee." (See Isa. iv. 4; Luke xiii. 33–34.)

Plainly, our Lord refers, by these words, to former generations of the nation, and his dealings with them, from the beginning; not merely to events which had occurred during his advent and appearing in the flesh. We know not that any prophet had been killed during our Lord's personal ministry except John the Baptist, whom Herod killed. But what is especially noticeable is, that our Lord characterizes this highly favored city only by its heaven-daring crimes. The prophets were God's ambassadors. But had they been only the ambassadors of an earthly king, they should have been received with honor, and their persons regarded as sacred.

An earthly king would have avenged, to the extent of his power, the dishonor done him by such flagrant wrongs

regard to his audience, but rather to his own greatness and glory, and the divine scheme into which the election of Israel entered and formed an important part. The temporary failure, or perhaps we should say the postponement, of the glorious consummation of this scheme, was not his fault, but theirs. They would not be gathered and blessed by him. They had reached the outermost limits of the divine forbearance, and would soon pass beyond them. With prophetic words, he therefore adds the sentence of the divine judgment for their national sins:

Verse 38. "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate."

As if he had said: "Behold, the land which God covenanted to your fathers, to be your dwelling-place in all your generations, is abandoned of God. His special care and providence over it are withdrawn. It is left to yourselves, to keep and protect as best you can. Soon it will be desolate.

The strength of the nation never consisted in its numbers. Moses taught the people (Deut. vii. 7), that the Lord did not choose them because they were more in number than any people; for they were the fewest of all people (Ps. cv. 12). Their strength and safety lay in the covenanted care and the special providence of God, as their whole history abundantly proves (Deut. iii. 22, xx. 4, xxxii. 30; Exod. xiv. 14; Lev. 26, 8; Josh. xxiii. 10; Ps. xxxv. 1, xliv. 4, 5), and that care and providence had been extended to them, during all their diversified fortunes, until this time. He was their king; and although in the days of Samuel they demanded another king to rule them, like all the nations (1 Sam. viii. 5, 9), yet he continued his theocratical rule over them through the kings he gave them, and even covenanted with David that his own anointed should descend from his loins (Acts ii. 30; Ps. cxxxii. 11). By the words we are now considering, the Theocracy was virtually, and even formally, withdrawn. The consequences of this change in their relations were foreshadowed by the word "desolate," but plainly declared, soon afterwards, to four of the disciples, in his prophetical discourse upon the Mount of Olives.

Verse 39. "For I say unto you, ye shall not see me

henceforth till ye say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

We regard this verse as a part of the apostrophe to the nation, as before explained, not as addressed especially to the auditory actually present in the temple. They import the excision of the nation from the high privileges of the covenant they had forfeited; yet without extinguishing the hope of the inferior blessings of an earthly pre-eminence among the nations in the world to come under Messiah's reign. (See notes on Matt. xxi. 43, 44.) But to come to particulars.

Our Lord connects the desolation he had just before spoken of, with his withdrawal from the nation as their Messiah and covenanted King. They imply, that he will not appear to them again to be rejected;—that is to say, his withdrawal from the nation, and the consequent desolation of their land, shall continue as long as their unbelief and disobedience. They imply also that when their unbelief and disobedience as a nation shall cease, and their hearts be prepared to receive him, then he will appear to them again; extend his care and protection to them, and repair their

going away from it—" and his disciples came to him for to show him the buildings of the temple,"—when his disciples came up to point out to him its structures and magnificence (Mark xiii. 1; Luke xxi. 5).

The disciples were Galileans, and probably much less familiar with the temple than the inhabitants of Jerusalem. On this account, perhaps, they were more sensibly struck with its beauty and grandeur. Thinking that their Master would share in their admiration, they desired to detain him while they could survey it together. But whatever may have been the motives of the disciples, the fact shows how little they understood our Lord's nature. As in their previous intercourse with him, they seem to have regarded him on this occasion also, as a man like themselves, in all the essentials of his nature, not as one to whom all the glories of the universe were familiarly known. But the special design of this verse is, as we suppose, to introduce our Lord's reply.

Verse 2. "And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things?"—are ye looking at these things?—"Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down,"—the days will come in which there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down (Luke xxi. 6).

We are not informed that the Saviour halted, as the disciples evidently desired he should; but we may suppose at least that he momentarily turned, and extending his hands towards the temple as if to demonstrate the meaning of his words, pronounced the startling prediction in the text. It was new to them; he had given no intimation of the kind before in public, or even in his private intercourse with them. Yet they believed it. Their confidence in him was implicit, as the next verse shows. But how, by what means, and when? They presumed not to ask him. The prediction, they well knew, would be regarded as criminal (not to say blasphemous) by their countrymen (Acts vi. 13, 14; Matt. xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40; Mark xiv. 58). If it were generally known, it would expose their Master to great personal danger. It was, therefore, a matter not to be much spoken of, even among themselves, and never except in the most confidential way. With such impressions, they

pursued their accustomed way from the temple to the Mount of Olives, in silence, as the evangelists allow us to suppose. But afterwards,

(Verse 3.) "As he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples"—four of the disciples, Peter, James, John, and Andrew (Mark xiii. 3),—"came unto him privately saying; Tell us" [confidentially] when shall these things be, and what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world" [αιωνος].

The fact that only four of the disciples, so far as we know, ventured to broach the subject of this prediction to the Saviour, and then only in a private or confidential way, shows that for some reason, if not that before suggested, the disciples thought it improper to question him publicly about the prediction, or even before the whole company of the disciples. But waiving further observations on this point, we proceed to the particulars upon which these disciples desired information. To ascertain these, we must determine the sense in which they themselves understood, and put their questions; and it is important to do so. Our Lord knew their meaning, and it is reasonable to suppose he responded to it, so far as the information called for was proper to be given. If this assumption be allowed, the sense in which the questions, were understood by the disciples may guide us to some extent in the interpretation of our Lord's answer; but not throughout; for nothing can be plainer than that the disciples entertained very imperfect views of the great events which they inquired about.

Most readers of the New Testament, and perhaps most commentators, take it for granted, that the disciples put these questions in the sense in which they are now generally understood; but this assumption requires investigation, as will appear, if we consider them separately.

The first question, "When shall these things be?" relates particularly, and we doubt not, exclusively, to the destruction of the temple foretold, in general terms, in the preceding (2d) verse. If we turn to Luke (xxi. 5, 7), we find no other antecedent to which "these things" can be referred. The stress of this question lies upon the *time:* "*When* shall the temple be destroyed—when shall it be so entirely demolished that not one stone of it shall be left

upon another?" According to Mark and Luke, this was the only event upon which they asked for further information. "*When* shall these things be, and *what the sign when* these things shall come to pass—be fulfilled."

The second question relates to the Lord's appearing, and particularly to the sign of it:—"What the sign (τῆς σῆς παρουσίας) of thy coming?" The disciples had been with him in the temple (xxiii. 1), and it is probable had left it with him. They had heard his parting words: "Ye shall not see me henceforth till ye say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." (Ps. cxviii. 26.) This declaration implied that his ministry at Jerusalem was ended, and that he was about to withdraw from the city, and remain absent from it, at least for a time, the length of which would depend upon the disposition of the people towards him. But it contained no intimation of the place he was about to retire to, nor of any sign or token of his return, after the people should be willing to receive him. On these points, or such as these, the disciples desired him to speak; but their own conceptions of them (we are justified by other passages in saying) were very imperfect. We must not suppose the disciples had in their mind the Lord's appearance from heaven in glory and power, or that they intended to inquire about such an appearance. They did not at that time even know whither he was going; but wherever it might be, it is probable they expected to accompany him, and remain with, and return with him. This is evident from John xiii. 36, 37, xiv. 5, xvi. 17, 18, 28, 29. They had no conception or thought of his going out of the world, nor of the means by which his exit from the world would be accomplished (John xx. 9; Luke xviii. 34, xxiv. 21). We must therefore understand the word (παρουσίας) translated *coming*, in its primary signification, *of being present*,* *in his proper*

* The word παρουσια is several times used in the epistles, to signify our Lord's appearance from heaven: 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8; James v. 7, 8; 2 Pet. i. 16; iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28, (and when so used it is synonymous with επιφανεια and αποκαλυψις, or nearly so) but this use of the word in all these places is founded upon that which our Lord makes of it in Matt. xxiv. 27, 37, 39, in his reply to these questions of the disciples, and is altogether different from that in which the disciples here use the word. It it noticeable that neither Mark nor Luke uses this

person, as in 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7, where Paul speaks of the coming (παρουσια) of Titus. (See 1 Cor. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. x. 10; Philip. i. 26, and ii. 12, where it is used as the contrasting word to απουσια, being absent.) His *being present again* after a period of absence implied his return from some place of which they were ignorant; and nothing more is involved in the question, or can be intended, when we consider how little the disciples at that time knew of the future. Nor did these disciples comprehend the answer of our Lord to their questions, at least in some of its most important particulars, until they received the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This will appear if we consider that Peter, who was one of them, two days afterwards did not know why he could not *then* follow his Master to the place whither he was going (John xiii. 36, 37, xiv. 5, xvi. 17, 18, 28, 29).

Their third question respected the ending (τοῦ αἰῶνος) of the world. It is not improbable that many readers mistake the meaning of the disciples in this inquiry. It is reasonable to suppose, that with the rest of their countrymen, they

their Master to Jerusalem. It should be considered also, that the disciples had no conception of the events which were to occur between the destruction of the temple and the Lord's return, nor of the length of time between these events. Nor can we infer from anything our Lord had previously said, or from their knowledge of the Divine purposes, or their expectations, that they understood the purpose for which the temple would be destroyed—whether it would be in judgment, for the sins of the nation, or to replace it by another, more magnificent or more suitable to the glory of the expected kingdom. They took it for granted also, that the Levitical economy would continue until it should be superseded by Messiah's reign. This is evident from the form of their question, "What the *sign* of thy coming *and* of the end of the (αιων) world." One and the same *sign*, they supposed, would serve for both these events. Had they understood the Divine purpose to open a dispensation of the gospel to the Gentiles, of long continuance, between these events, it is natural to suppose they would have changed the order of their questions, and asked a sign for each event,—"What will the sign of the consummation of this (αιων) dispensation, and what the sign of thy coming to establish thy kingdom?"

The words συντελειας του αιωνος should be rendered the end or consummation of the age or dispensation, or the expiration of the age. There is no reason to suppose the disciples intended to inquire about the end of the world (in the common acceptation of the phrase) or the consummation of all earthly things. The great matter of interest to them was the establishment of their Master's kingdom. This they thought could not be expected till he should appear again at Jerusalem, and supersede the existing polity of the nation by establishing his own. Hence they connected these closely related events in one question, under the preconceived opinion or expectation of their concurrent occurrence. The phrase συντελεια του αιωνος occurs in the gospels, only in Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxviii. 20 (see Heb. ix. 26), where it denotes the consummation of the present order of things in the world. In the mind of the Saviour that event was much more remote than the disciples conceived it to be; yet in all those places, the period denoted by the phrase reaches

to and connects with the outward establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. The disciples (not knowing of the destruction of their nation, the dispersion of their people, the calling of the elect church out of the Gentiles, to be continued through many generations), thought the kingdom would be joined upon and immediately succeed the Levitical economy (Acts i. 6). The Saviour knew the misconception, but left it for the Holy Spirit to correct; while he adapted his language to the course of events as he foresaw them.

It is important to apprehend correctly the sense or meaning of the disciples in the inquiries they propounded to the Saviour. In a general sense they constitute the subject of his reply, but owing to the imperfection of their knowledge, and their ignorance and misconceptions of the Divine purposes, they are not to be regarded as arrangements adopted by our Lord in his prophetical reply, much less are we authorized to suppose that he limited his meaning to their conceptions of the events they inquired about.

Verses 4, 5. "And Jesus answered and said to them, Take heed that no one deceive you: for many shall come

It was for the public instruction of all that people, as well those who should not become his followers, as those who should. The misapprehension of the disciples *as to the manner* of Messiah's coming to establish his kingdom was common to the nation at that time, and has been in all their generations since. This caution, therefore, though not necessary to guard the apostles against deceivers (other and more effectual means having been appointed, in respect to them, for that purpose), was necessary for multitudes of that people who were to be less favored. No unbelieving Jew expects that the Messiah will appear in the clouds of heaven. This is a doctrine of Christianity which the Jews reject. The caution, therefore, we regard as *a warning to Jews*, especially designed to guard them against deceivers, who were to arise from time to time during the whole of their future history, and through this common error of the nation, mislead all who denied or would not regard the Divine mission and authority of the Lord Jesus.

It is noticeable, too, that our Lord here expressly claims the name or title of Christ—("Many shall come in *my* name, saying, I am Christ")—thereby showing that the outward assumption of the title was another note or mark by which deceivers might be infallibly known. (See notes on Matt. xi. 3, xvi. 20.) For the reader must remember, that hitherto he had not publicly assumed that character (John x. 24), and did not, until he was adjured by the High Priest to avow the character which he sustained (Matt. xxvi. 63; Mark xiv. 61; Luke xxii. 67, 68).

Verse 6. "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: See that ye be not troubled: For all these things must come to pass but (το τελος) the end is not yet."

The special design of the prophecy of the appearing of false Christs was, as we have just said, to enforce a caution of the utmost importance, on account of the prevailing misapprehension of the Jews relative to the manner in which the Messiah would come to establish his kingdom. As to his first coming, they were right in supposing that he would appear after the manner of men (Matt. ii. 5; John vii. 41, 27, 31; iv. 25). But having ignorantly rejected him as a false Christ, as a consequence of their error, they would be continually thereafter looking for another, who should come *in the same way.*

Now he adds: "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars." But these would not be proximate signs of the *end* about which they inquired. We have here an example of the double sense and are able to show, with some probability, the ground or reason of it. The disciples, as we have seen, thought that the end of the Levitical economy and of the existing physical order or condition of things in the world would concur in point of time, and that *both* would be followed *immediately* by Messiah's kingdom, which they conceived would be exceedingly glorious. The Saviour's conception was very different. He knew that a long interval was laid, in the Divine purpose, between the ending of the Levitical economy and his second coming—in other words, that the end of the Levitical economy would not mark or concur in point of time with the end of the existing physical order of things in the world (see note on Acts iii. 21, Vol. x. 573, 578), although the existing physical order of things would be terminated by his coming in his kingdom. The different senses of the word (τέλος) *end* therefore result from the different conceptions the disciples

Rom. i. 8.) The answer, thus understood, fully met the question in the sense it was put by the disciples. They were, in fact, incapable at that time of understanding it in any other sense, owing to their ignorance of the Divine purposes in regard to the calling of the Gentiles (Acts x. 34, 35). Departing, however, from the destruction of the Jewish state as an epoch, and stretching through the then mysterious and undefined period of mercy allotted to the Gentiles; the end of the present physical order of things and the epoch of Messiah's kingdom will come, when this gospel shall have been preached, as it were a second time, throughout a much more extended (οἰκουμένῃ) area than that *then* occupied by the nations. This sense is involved in the prophecy of the third mission of the servants in the parable of the marriage (Matt. xxiii. 9; see notes ante pp. 89, 90).

The words (τέλος) *end* and (οἰκουμένῃ) *world*, then both have, it is conceived, a double, that is a limited and an enlarged sense, corresponding with the limited sense in which the question was put by the disciples, and the enlarged sense in which it was understood by the Saviour. According to the conception of the disciples, the answer of our Lord was fulfilled, as the event showed, in the brief space of forty years—or less. According to our Lord's conception of the question, as interpreted by the Divine purposes, his answer is yet in progress of fulfilment. According to this view, in the mind of the Saviour, the passage of which this verse forms the conclusion, really extends from the time of the delivery of the prophecy to his second coming, while in the mind of the disciples it could reach only to the end of the Jewish polity, with which they generally connected the return of their Master:—In other words, Besides the plain obvious meaning of the language, considered as responsive to the question of the disciples, in the sense in which they put it, there was a hidden meaning, founded upon the mysteries of the kingdom (see Matt. chap. xiii.) which the Saviour left for the Holy Spirit to unfold to the apostles, in connexion with the developments of his providence in a new dispensation.

We pause not to consider whether this observation is applicable to all the announcements of this passage. The question is difficult, and different views of it have been

entertained by commentators, ancient and modern. (See Grotius, Calovius, Jerome, Augustine, on vs. 6.) That they were all designed as notes of personal warning to the apostles and the Christians of their age, and were fulfilled in their experience, we do not doubt, nor should we, even if there were no historical record of the events (compare vs. 9 with John xvi. 2; Matt. xxii. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16). Beyond this, we perceive no sufficient data for any certain conclusions.

Verse 15. "When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth let him understand)."

If we understand the word "end" (in the 6th and 14th verses), in the sense of the Saviour, this verse is a resuming, or going back from the yet future end of the present dispensation, to its beginning, or nearly. But if we understand it in the sense of the disciples, as denoting simply the end of the Jewish polity, this verse would be in regular prosecution of the prophetic narrative. Plainly, it is introductory of the events and consequences of the siege of Jerusalem. The language is figurative, and evidently addressed

I. To the first of these periods we assign vs. 4–14 (inclusive) of this chapter, and the corresponding verses of the other evangelists (Mark xiii. 5–13; and Luke xxi. 8–19). This period, as before observed, is the same as that denoted by the second mission of the servants, in the parable of the marriage (Matt. xxii. 4–6). (See notes, ante, pp. 87, 88, and 83.)

The reader should reflect upon this coincidence. It is quite agreeable to our Lord's manner of teaching (Matt. xiii. 11); discriminating, as we had frequent occasion to remark, between the careless and unfriendly multitudes and his disciples. It is also a beautiful example of the harmony which pervades his discourses upon this last great day of his public ministry.

There is a difference, also, between the evangelists, in this part, too important to be overlooked. Mark and Luke omit the observation of the Saviour which Matthew records in the 14th verse: "And this gospel, &c., shall be preached in all the world (οἰκουμένῃ), for a witness unto all nations, and then shall (τὸ τέλος) the end come." In this expression, chiefly, as we have seen, lies the double sense, which the disciples at that time were incapable of apprehending. But observe: Mark and Luke record only one of the questions of the disciples; that, *namely*, respecting the destruction of the temple; and consistently, therefore, they record only so much of the Saviour's answer as had respect to that question. Indeed, if they had introduced into their narratives the matter of this 14th verse, it would have been due to accuracy, and even truth, to have introduced the other two questions of the disciples. The observation is important, because it shows us why we are not to look for a double sense in this portion of Mark and Luke. It is delightful to notice these congruities. They are designed; and although not commonly pointed out, even by the learned, they are really a perfect moral demonstration of the inspiration of the evangelists. No fabricator of false writings could make, or even imagine so nice an adjustment of parts. Nay, more—no writer, untaught by the Holy Spirit in the mysteries of the kingdom, could even perceive the need of it in this instance.

II. Under the head of Jerusalem's desolation we include

not only the actual destruction of the city by the Romans, but the continued desolation of the land, the captivity and dispersion of the people during the eighteen centuries which have followed. The period is undefined in prophecy, but Luke relatively marks it as coextensive with the times of the Gentiles; perhaps he means the times of mercy appointed to the Gentiles, as well as the times of their power (chap. xxi. 24). To the epoch of the destruction of the city by the Romans, we assign vs. 15–27 of this chapter; also Mark xiii. 14–23; and Luke xxi. 20, 21, 23, and the first clause of the 24th verse. To the ensuing ages of the desolation of the city and the land, and its subjection to Gentile power, and the condition of the people during the same period, we assign the 22d, and the last clause of the 24th verse of Luke xxi. Matthew xxiv .28, appears to refer especially to the condition of the people during the same prolonged period. Mark passes (at vs. 24), from the calamities immediately consequent upon the destruction of the city, to the third of the great periods before mentioned, without any notice of intervening events. Let us attend now to some of

they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, *he is* in the secret chambers; believe *it* not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

The Saviour here returns to his prediction of the appearance of false Christs, as if to impress it the more deeply upon the minds of his followers. We do not suppose that this was intended especially for the four disciples who questioned him, or even for the apostles; for we know that all but one of them suffered death before the destruction of the city. Nor would they, as before observed, be in danger of being deceived by false Christs or false prophets, for they were soon afterwards taught, by the Holy Spirit (see Acts i. 9–11, iii. 21), that their Master would not appear again (*more humano*), after the manner of men. To multitudes of the nation, however, to whom this gospel would be known, and who, by the happening of the events the Saviour foretold, might be almost persuaded of his divine mission, these were benign warnings, to which it is not improbable many gave heed.

Verses 26–27. "Wherefore, if they shall say unto you Behold he is in the desert; go not forth: behold *he is* in the secret chambers; believe *it* not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."

We regard this 27th verse as a simile or comparison designed simply to show the difference between the manner of the appearance of the Son of Man, and of these false Christs. Our Lord does not affirm that he will, at the epoch of the destruction of Jerusalem, make his appearance, but that when he next appears, the manner of his appearance will be as different from that of these false Christs, as the appearance of the lightning's flash is from the natural approach of a human being. In other words: it will be as impossible to mistake his appearance for that of any other human being, as it will be to mistake a flash of lightning from one end of heaven to the other, for any other phenomenon of nature.

Verse 28. "For (and) wheresoever the carcass (το πτῶμα) is, there will the eagles be gathered together."

Under this expressive image (το πτῶμα, the carcass), our Lord represents the nation, during the whole period of the calamities, which were to follow the destruction of their city and country. He employs it as a permanent symbol of the nation during the whole period of its subjection to Gentile power. The prophet Ezekiel (ch. xxxvii.) represents the whole house of Israel under the imagery of dry bones. The symbol our Lord employs, while it expresses with equal emphasis the spiritual death of the nation, is designed principally to represent its exposure to the power of their enemies. Thus considered it is full of meaning. The Elect nation, hitherto so highly favored of God, is represented as a carcass cast out into the waste, without the common privilege of burial or any permanent resting-place—continually preyed upon, without being consumed, by ravenous birds. Consistently with this exposition, we understand the eagles to represent not the Roman power only, but all those Gentile powers which have since hitherto persecuted and oppressed this outcast nation.

This meaning of the symbol we derive from the evange-

guage of Luke was employed with the design to explain the dark and awful saying of the Lord, and to show its application, we do not doubt. But to verify this opinion would require an examination of the things predicted by the prophets, and the histories of their fulfilment, in order to perceive the aptness and the force of the symbols here employed by the Saviour to represent them. This is a labor of time, which we must leave to the reader.

We add: this period (which, like the preceding, belongs to Jewish history) is still current. The end of it is among the unrevealed purposes of the Father (Acts i. 7). Relatively to the Church, that is, to the period appointed for the gathering of the Elect Church (or that subrogated nation of which our Lord spoke at the conclusion of the parable of the vineyard, see Matt. xxi. 43 and notes), we know, however, that it is the same, each being, in fact, the measure of the other. (See Luke xxi. 24.) And it is with a view, as we conceive, to this coincidence, the Saviour introduces in the sequel of this discourse, the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. xxv. 1–12) which relates especially to his advent as Messiah, to receive his elect people, and not to his advent as the Son of Man, for the judgment of all nations.

III. According to the distribution before indicated, the third period—or the period of distress of the nations—is yet future. Gentile power is still dominant in the earth. Ever since the fall of Jerusalem the Romans, and the nations which have succeeded to their dominion, have preyed like vultures upon the carcass and scattered members of the Jewish Commonwealth—a fact, which of itself proves, that the predicted period of their distresses has not yet commenced. (See Jerem. xlvi. 28, xxv. 15–33.) Distresses they have felt, inflicted by each other, yet always under the restraining hand of God, but none such as they have inflicted on the Jews. The symbols which the Saviour employs to denote the events of this period (in Matt. xxiv. 29; Mark xiii. 24, 25; Luke xxi. 25, 26—the verses which we assign to this period) betoken extraordinary Divine judgments; such as have never yet been seen or felt. (See 2 Thess. i. 1–9; Mal. iv.; Is. ii. 10–22, lxvi. 15, 16.)

The futurity of this period may be inferred also from the language of the evangelists. "Immediately after (מיד אחר

των ἡμερων εκεινων) the tribulation of those days," &c., says Matthew; that is, immediately after the end of the period appointed for the tribulation of the Jews. The language of Mark (xiii. 24) is equivalent, because he says expressly, that it is *after* (την θλιψιν εκεινην) that tribulation which he had before described as coming upon the Jews. Luke is the most explicit. He shows that this tribulation (θλιψις) includes the whole (ὀργὴ εν τῳ λαῳ τουτῳ) of the wrath foretold against that people, which, as Mr. Alford remarks, "is yet being inflicted, and the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, is still going on."

Besides these arguments, derived from the texts, there is another of great force, founded upon God's method of dealing with Jews and Gentiles, which is distinctly noticed by St. Paul in Rom. xi. 30, 31, 33 (and see verse 11 and 12, 19–22, i. 16). This method hitherto has been characterised by alternations of mercy and judgment; first to the Jew, and then to the Gentile. The period of Judah's desolation is the appointed period of mercy to the Gentiles, and of the preaching of the gospel to them for the gathering of an

earthly theocracy than the former was; and if such be the Divine purpose, it would be analogical with the purpose to be accomplished during the period of Jerusalem's desolation, viz. the gathering of an elect nation out of the Gentiles, to be constituted into a *heavenly* theocracy, or a kingdom of kings and priests. But this is offered simply as a conjecture, the value of which depends upon the support it receives from the predictions of the ancient prophets. We confess to the belief, however, that some great purpose, besides merely that of inflicting judgments upon the nations, will be accomplished during this period; and also to our ignorance, what that purpose can be, unless that which we have suggested. (See Dan. xii. 1 and 12.)

IV. The next period is that of the visible advent of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven (Matt. xxiv. 30, 31; Mark xiii. 26, 27; Luke xxi. 27), with which we connect the judgment of the nations, Matt. xxv. 31–46. Not that we suppose the judgment of the nations described in the latter passage will immediately succeed upon the advent described in the former of these passages. On the contrary, there may be a very long interval between them, to be filled up with the greatest imaginable events. All the things predicted by the apostle John, from Rev. xix. 11 to the end of the xxth chapter, even the judgment of all the dead may intervene. On this point we affirm nothing. But we may perhaps safely affirm that with the advent of the Son of Man in power and great glory, will commence a new era of the Divine administration over man and this earth, in which that great and glorious being will take an open and direct control over this part of his dominions.

These observations, though proper for explanation, are aside from our present purpose, which is to consider the structure of the Lord's discourse, and the logical connection of its parts, which we conceive to be in itself a matter of importance. We proceed therefore to say, that if this be the just connection of the discourse as recorded by Matthew, we may regard the passage from Matt. xxiv. 32 to xxv. 30, inclusive, as parenthetical, or we may consider Matt. xxv. 31–46, as a resuming of the prophetical discourse at xxiv. 31, which the Saviour suspended at that verse for the purpose of giving some private notes or tokens of warning,

admonition, and exhortation to his followers. It may be added that the passages in Mark xiii. 28–37, and Luke xxi. 28–36, are of this admonitory nature.

This period—that of the advent—we conceive, will be separated from the preceding by an interval of some extent. This opinion is founded upon the description our Lord himself gives of the world at the time of his coming (in vs. 37, 39, and see Luke xvii. 26–30). Ignorant and regardless of the impending event, the masses of the nations will be in eager pursuit of all the delights of this life, as they were in the days of Noah; and Paul, writing by inspiration (1 Thess. v. 2, 3), describes the day of the Lord's coming as a time of supposed peace and safety. Accordingly we understand the 29th and 30th verses of this chapter thus:

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days"—that is, immediately after the termination of that period, during which the Jewish body politic, or state, is represented in the preceding verse as a dead carcass preyed upon by vultures—the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the powers of the heavens shall be

notes the attention of the reader has been frequently called to the different relations our Lord sustains to Israel, to the church, and to the world. (See the note on Matt. xii. 8, vol. xi. p. 23; also, see notes on Matt. viii. 23–27, 28–32, ix. 2, xiv. 17, xvi. 13, 14, 27, xviii. 22, 23, xxii. 41–45.) As Messiah, he has a kingdom of kings and priests,—a multitude which no one can number collected out of all nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues (Rev. vi. 4–9). These he will glorify and exalt to a partnership in his throne (Rev. iii. 21, and see notes on Matt. xxi. 43, xxii. 14). It is to that small portion of this immensely great and glorious body, who shall be living unglorified in the flesh at the end of this dispensation, that the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. xxv. 1–12) is designed to be applied. These were all given to him by covenant (πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 20; and see John xvii. 24), *before* the foundation of the world. In an especial sense they are his purchased possession (Eph. i. 14). They constitute an accession of accumulated glory to him, in compensation, so to speak, for the immense cost of the Divine achievement of redemption (Isaiah liii. 11). Their inheritance is a coheirship of all things with Christ (1 Cor. iii. 21, 23; Rev. xxi. 7; Rom. viii. 17, 29, 30).

Different widely from these are those of the judged nations, whom, at the day of his coming, he shall set at his right hand. They are called to inherit a kingdom prepared for them in this world (ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κοσμου) *from* (not before) the foundation thereof.*

These considerations might be enforced by others derived

* The attention of the critical reader is called to the distinction between these two phrases, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (found in Matt. xiii. 35, xxv. 34; Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3, ix. 26; Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8), and πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (found in John xvii. 24; Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 20). That they are not equivalent no scholar can doubt. That the latter expression is applied in these places only to the elect Church, or that kingdom of kings and priests, whom it is the purpose of God to substitute in the place of Israel according to the flesh under the covenant of Horeb, will be obvious to any one who reads these passages, while the former, in the place now under consideration, may be regarded as exegetical of Ps. cxv. 16 (latter clause) and of Dan. vii. 27. And the aptness of the expression consists in this: that the designed use of the world, even in the mind of the Creator, may be properly said to concur in point of time with its origin or foundation.

from the expressed grounds of approval and reprobation. "I was an hungered and ye gave me meat," etc. vs. 35, "I was an hungered and ye gave me *no* meat," etc. vs. 42. It is a judgment founded simply on works of mercy; not on faith, and whatever else may be represented or intended by the *oil* in the virgins' lamps (xxv. 3, 4). But our object at present is not an exposition of the passage, but to indicate what appear to be sufficient reasons for the foregoing distribution of the discourse.

If it should be said that the reward conferred is eternal life, it would not follow from that, that those thus rewarded are aggregated to that elect body or kingdom of kings and priests before mentioned. The Lord can bestow the one without the other. (See vs. 14–23; Luke xix. 15–19.) But we presume not to speculate on questions which belong only to the Divine disposal; feeling assured that the Judge of all the earth is not straitened either in his wisdom or power to accomplish whatever he has proposed or pleases. The exigencies of creation are infinitely more various and vast than any finite mind can conceive.

As if he had said, *Now*, the kingdom of heaven is like a certain king, who invited many to the marriage festival of his son, and none of those invited were willing or worthy to come. But *then* it will be quite otherwise. For *then* the kingdom of heaven shall be like a bridegroom returning with his bride (see Codex Bezæ), when many will be willing, and more than are worthy, to come and enter in to the marriage.

As observed before, this parable, with the preceding context (from xxiv. 32), and the succeeding (to xxv. 30, inclusive), may be regarded as parenthetical, if considered relatively to the *whole thread* of the discourse. But, however this may be, the whole of this passage refers to the church, or to the company called and collected by the servants of the king, on their *third* mission (Matt. xxii. 9–14; see xxi. 43, and notes), and not to the masses of the nations. This parable and that which follows (xxv. 14–30) relate to our Lord in his Messianic character or relation, and to his kingdom as Messiah—not to his Adamic relations or his kingdom as the Son of Man. Compare the qualifications essential for admission into our Lord's kingdom as Messiah with the grounds of his judgment of the nations of the earth as the Son of Man. In the former, each must wear the wedding garment (xxiv. 11, 12), each virgin must have oil in her lamp (xxv. 3, 4), each servant must have performed service in the faithful use of the talents committed to him (xxv. 20–30). In the latter case, however, the blessed of the Father are blessed, and inherit the kingdom *prepared for them*, on the ground of their works of mercy (xxv. 34–40), and the cursed are cursed, because they performed no such works (xxv. 41–46).

Let no one pervert this rule of judgment by applying it to the present dispensation or order of things. It belongs to a future one. The present dispensation has for its end the most glorious purposes. The highest privileges and the greatest responsibilities are cast upon all to whom the gospel is preached (see note on Matt. xvii. 22, 23), and the rule of judgment is suited to this condition. The man *without* the wedding garment (Matt. xxii. 12, 13) and the merely *unprofitable* servant (xxv. 30) are cast into outer darkness, and the virgin without oil in her lamp will find no admission to the marriage (xxv. 10. See Gal. vi. 7).

VI. Another observation upon the whole prophecy is, that no chronological note (by which the times of any of the events discoursed upon by the Saviour can be determined) is given by him. None of the periods before mentioned, nor the intervals, if any, *between* them, are chronologically defined. Even the destruction of Jerusalem, the nearest of the events spoken of, was foretokened by a providential event which did not occur within the life-time of three of the disciples the Saviour personally addressed. The same general remark is applicable to the second period, considered either as the period of the desolation of Jerusalem, or as that appointed for the calling and completing of that elect nation to be substituted in the place of Israel (Matt. xxi. 43, and note), viz. the church of Christ.

During this period the Jewish Commonwealth is represented as a carcass, a symbol which excludes the idea of a chronology. Luke, though he uses plain language, gives us no means of ascertaining the number of the days of vengeance, or the continuance of the times of the Gentiles. But if we consider this period as that appointed for the for-

our Lord's express teachings, whenever he was inquired of concerning the times (Acts i. 7), and is in harmony with the ancient prophecies concerning the advent of Messiah. (See Journal, Vol. ix., 198–215.)

VII. One observation more:—The Revelation of St. John may be regarded as a symbolical explanation of this prophecy or of the principal parts of it. Certainly both stretch forward into the same distant futurity, and may reasonably be supposed to have at least some points of coincidence. We doubt not that light would be thrown upon each, by a comparison with the other. It is remarkable, though the writer does not remember to have seen it remarked by others, that the apostle records his visions under four symbolical captions or headings purporting to be the medium through which he received them. These may be designed to parcel or distribute the matters of the prophecy to distinct subjects, and also to denote lesser epochs, or different and perhaps successive stages in the progress of the Divine administration. Thus in Rev. iv. 1, John saw *a door opened* in heaven, and certain visions followed. In Rev. xi. 19, the scene is changed, The *temple of God is opened* in heaven. Afterwards (xv. 5) *The temple of the tabernacle of the testimony* in heaven *was opened.* And finally, xix. 11, he saw *heaven opened.* Do these divisions or partitions correspond to any extent with the four periods under which we have considered our Lord's prophecy? We do not affirm it—we only suggest the question (but with great diffidence) to the consideration of the learned reader; and we do it because every coincidence between writings so important, and so difficult to be understood, is worthy of serious consideration. Light may break in from a quarter we do not anticipate.

From the foregoing analysis it appears that the great subject of this wonderful prophecy is the way of Providence over *this world and the nations thereof*, from the rejection of the Lord Jesus by the Jewish nation, until the final settlement of all things earthly under his Headship as the *Son of Man.* (See 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25; Heb. ii. 8.) The fortunes of the church are not distinctly or directly brought into view. For these we must turn to the Revelation of St. John, and other parts of the sacred volume. The admonitions and cautions of the Lord, and the similitudes in the xxvth

chapter are digressive from the main purpose; and designed as personal warnings to his followers; supplying rules and motives for each and all in every age, until he should come as the bridegroom to receive them. Of this event he gives them a sign—"the sign of the Son of Man in heaven"—which we suppose will precede his actual appearance.* Having enforced his command and cautions by two impressive parables, he resumes the great line of vision, and pursues it to the end, when all rule, and all authority and power adverse to him shall have been subdued, and he alone be acknowledged and obeyed as the KING of the kings and the LORD of the lords of the world.

That this judgment of the nations will not occur till after the millennium may be assumed (Rev. xx. 1–10), as the power of the devil, over the earth and the nations, will then have been finally and for ever destroyed. But, relatively to the time of the judgment of the dead (Rev. xx. 11–15, which is represented as a distinct act of judgment), we have no data for any conclusion. Perhaps, however, we should not err in supposing that (τὰ ἔθνη τῶν σωζομένων) the nations

they who receive them, are to be released from the curse of sin, and accepted and admitted to his kingdom; of the intimacy of the relations to him to which they are to be exalted, and of the greatness and glory of the offices they are to fill. We propose to unfold them briefly.

The letters were written and sent to the churches, chap. i, 11, on a scroll, that could be preserved, read publicly whenever the minister or church chose, and transcribed by whoever pleased for private use. Whether the scroll for each church contained only the letter to that church, or comprised them all, is not clear. The chief part of each letter is addressed to the angel of the church to which it was written; that is, the messenger sent by that church to the apostle, for the purpose, doubtless, of receiving instruction from him, and if vouchsafed, new revelations from Christ; —the word angel literally denoting a messenger, and being used in that sense, in the New Testament, of men, as well as of the order of spiritual beings who come as messengers from heaven to our world. The messenger of each church was accordingly the person sent by it to the apostle, and by whom he transmitted the letter he had written to it. These messengers, it is manifest from Christ's addresses to them, were the chief teachers of the seven churches.

Christ announces himself in the letters as having the titles, prerogatives, and characteristics, and filling the offices that are claimed by, and are ascribed to him, in the first vision, chap. i. In the first he speaks as he who holds the seven stars in his right hand, and walks in the midst of the golden candlesticks. In the second, as the First and the Last, who had been dead and lives again. In the last, as the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the Head of the creation of God. In his addresses to the several messengers, he proclaims his perfect knowledge of the manner in which they exercised their offices, commends them for their faith, patience, and love, and reproves them for their defects, exhorts them to repentance and fidelity, and threatens them and the church, if unfaithful, with judgments. The promises with which the several letters close are addressed to whoever is victorious, whether official or private members of the church.

In the first, to the messenger of the church in Ephesus

Christ announces himself as he who holds the seven stars, the symbols of the messengers of the churches, in his right hand—indicating the absoluteness of his dominion over them, the intimacy and dignity of their relation to him, and the significance of the office they fill; and who walks in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, the symbols of the seven churches—bespeaking his presence and watchful notice of them. He enjoins the messenger who had fallen from his first love, to reform and do his first works, or he would remove his candlestick out of its place: that is, divest him of his church, by extinguishing it, or driving it into exile. While, on the one hand, that warning was used to rouse the delinquent teacher to his duty, a promise of equal significance is given, on the other, to encourage him, and all others, to fidelity in the conflict to which they were called.

"He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches. To him who overcomes—conquers, is victorious—I will give to eat of the tree of life in the paradise of God." The tree of life in paradise was the tree of which our first parents, had they maintained a perfect obedience during their trial, would at its close have been permitted to eat, and would by virtue of it have become immortal. Their participation of it accordingly would have been a signal to them of their perfect approval by God, and a pledge of their exemption thereafter from all further trial by temptation, and all liability to incur death—the penalty of sin. It would have been a proof, therefore, and confirmation of their perfect holiness, and assurance of their safety and happiness for ever. Had they continued in obedience, their public acceptance at the termination of their trial, and assignment by such a rite to eternal life, would undoubtedly have been to them of unspeakable significance and beauty. It would have been an honor of the greatest resplendence. For what can transcend the glory of an acceptance by God on the ground of an obedience, through a probation, so pure and fervent, that he justly regards it as proof that they will continue to be obedient through an endless existence, and rewards it by the gift of an immortal life? It would have formed, therefore, an epoch in their being of the greatest interest and grandeur. It would have been an end to enemies, an end to dangers, an end to struggles; and would

have clad the interminable future to them in the light of perfect peace, security, communion with God, and blessedness in him and in other holy beings.

But what such an acceptance and endowment with an immortal life would have been to them, that, the promise teaches, the acceptance and investiture with immortality will be to those who are victorious in the trial to which they are now subjected as Christ's disciples. The act or rite by which they will be released from the sentence to death, and constituted immortal, will be one of unspeakable power and grandeur. The moment will be one of the most august in their existence. From what a doom will it free them! To what a beauty and splendor of person it will exalt them! What a future of spotlessness, of activity, of glory and bliss it will unfold to them! And what an expression it will form of the love of Christ! The wonder, the gratitude, the adoration, the joy that will throb in the breasts of the redeemed who are given to eat of the tree of life, in the paradise of God, will probably transcend in greatness and beauty that which our first parents would have felt had they triumphed in their trial, and received that pledge of their acceptance and immortality in holiness and bliss.

In the letter to the messenger of the church of Smyrna, Christ speaks as the first and the last, who was dead, and has life; and referring to the messenger's affliction, poverty, and reproach from those who falsely called themselves Jews, enjoins him not to fear what he is to suffer; forewarns him that the church is to be persecuted; and promises, if faithful unto death, to give him a crown of life. Then follows the injunction and pledge:

"He that has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches. He who overcomes—is victorious—cannot be hurt of the second death." It was specially designed, therefore, to guard them from the danger of apostasy, to which the suffering they were to meet exposed them. The alternative presented to them was the avoidance here, by apostasy, of suffering and death on Christ's account, and the endurance, as the consequence, of the second death hereafter; or obedience to Christ here, under great trials, and submission to death for his sake, and exemption, in consequence of it, from eternal death. The motive to fidelity

here, is thus as vast as that of the first letter, though of an opposite nature. There it is the attainment of an immortal life in holiness and bliss; here it is exemption from endless death in sin and misery. That was intended to rouse to hope and encourage; this to awe and restrain. In that, acceptance by Christ is contemplated as a decree to immortal life; here, as a release from eternal death. And in this relation the act of justification will undoubtedly be of unspeakable significance to the believer. To be publicly released from all liability to the penalty incurred by sin, and admitted to as perfect an acceptance and assurance of everlasting safety and happiness, as those intelligences who have never fallen enjoy, must be an event of ineffable moment to the ransomed, and will shed a resplendent light on their endless being.

In the letter to the church of Pergamos, Christ speaks as he whose tongue is a sharp two-edged sword, and apprises the messenger that he knows that his dwelling is where Satan's throne is, and that he holds fast his name and his faith; reminds him that he has some in the church who

life, that will be to him what the literal manna was to those who subsisted on it in the desert; and denotes, undoubtedly, gifts of the Spirit, communications of knowledge, aids to love, supports and advancements in trust, that will confirm, exalt, and give vigor to the life of the soul, and bear it on in a perpetual progress in intelligence, fervor and beauty of affection, and blessedness.

The figure of the white stone is probably drawn from a custom of the Roman emperors, in the age of the apostles, of throwing to those who contended successfully in the games, white stones or balls, inscribed with names of tasteful articles—ornaments, dresses, arms, equipages, which entitled the finders, on application, to receive each as a present from the emperor the article inscribed on the ball he had had the fortune to grasp. They were sometimes thrown not only to victors in the games, but to the crowd. It was a mode therefore of distributing elegant and costly gifts, in a way that at first none but the receiver knew what the gift was that was to be conferred on him. Those who obtained them, were regarded as peculiarly favored, not only on account of the articles they received, but because of the distinction they acquired as objects of the imperial bounty.

The promise, accordingly, denotes the bestowment, in a resembling manner, of analogous blessings in Christ's kingdom, on those who are victorious in the conflicts to which they are here called in his service. 1. The gift then will be sovereign, bestowed out of Christ's bounty and love. 2. It will be known beforehand by a token that the individual on whom it is bestowed is to receive it. 3. Its nature, however, no one but he that receives it will know, till it is publicly conferred. 4. If analogy is sustained throughout, there will be a period between the receipt of the token which will foreshow the bestowment of the gift, and the bestowment itself of the blessing denoted by the token. 5. The blessing will be of a nature that will give the individual distinction as an object of Christ's approval, and will be one therefore that is not conferred upon all. 6. It will be to the recipient, as an heir of Christ's kingdom, what a costly and beautiful present from the Roman emperor, as a robe, a gem, a ring, a sword, a chariot, was to a subject of his empire—a token of Christ's special favor, and giving the

recipient a distinction of dignity and honor in the eyes of others. What the special gift, or gifts are to be, we are left to conjecture. As those denoted by the manna are of a spiritual nature, these are probably exterior signals of Christ's love, such as glories of person, rank, authority, spheres of activity and influence, offices of dignity and love.

If it be supposed that the token symbolized by the white stone, is given to the victorious believer on his entrance into heaven at death, but that the blessing, of which it is the token, is to be bestowed at Christ's second coming, when he is to raise the saints in glory, and exalt them to stations as kings and priests in his kingdom—the promise seems a very natural and a very gracious one; as it then indicates that those who are faithful to Christ here, will, during their disembodied life, receive signals known only to them, that they are to be distinguished by peculiar marks of Christ's favor in the kingdom he is to institute, when he comes in his glory. Whether, however, those tokens are given during their intermediate life, or not, the time undoubtedly when the blessings themselves, of which they

eminent spiritual gifts in his kingdom, and exalt them to stations and honors that will bespeak in an emphatic manner his approval and love.

In the letter to the messenger of the church in Thyatira, Christ announces himself as he whose eyes are as a flame of fire, and his feet like glowing brass,—at the sight of whom the beholder is overpowered with awe,—and acknowledging the messenger's labor and love, and faith, and endurance, reminds him that his wife is a false prophetess, and a seducer to idolatry; and forewarns him that unless she repents, he will punish her and her associates and disciples with great afflictions and death; and give all the churches to see his knowledge and abhorrence of their crimes. To those, however, who reject her false doctrine, he promises exemption from those punishments; and then adds:

"And he who overcomes, and who keeps my works unto the end, I will give him power over the nations, and he shall rule them with an iron sceptre, as vessels of clay are broken, as I have received of my Father. And I will give him the morning star. He that has an ear let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches."

The power over the nations thus promised to the victorious, is that undoubtedly with which the saints are to be invested at their resurrection in glory at Christ's second coming; in the exercise of which they are to reign with him during the period denoted by the thousand years: and that which it is foreshown, Daniel vii. 18, 22, 27, they are to receive at Christ's coming in the clouds, when the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom before held by the powers symbolized by the wild beast, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever: "and the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." This promise, therefore, like those prophecies, reveals Christ's glorious purpose to exalt his disciples, who are victorious in their conflicts here, to stations of authority and dignity in the kingdom he is to establish on the earth at his second coming, and give them to exert an important agency in the

great measures that are to distinguish his millennial reign. That "they are to rule the nations with an iron sceptre as vessels of clay are broken," shows that the nations are to continue in the natural life after Christ comes and commences his reign: as if they are to be immediately destroyed, and the agency of the saints towards them is to be employed simply in their destruction, they could not be said to rule them. To rule them will be to exercise a government over them, in which laws are proclaimed and enforced, and penalties inflicted on such as are rebellious, and rewards bestowed on those who are obedient. To inflict punishments merely for disobedience to laws of a former dispensation, would be to act as executors merely of the will of another ruler; not as vindicating rights with which they are themselves invested. The nations then are manifestly to continue in the natural life after Christ comes and institutes his millennial kingdom, and are to be put to a trial under the dominion of the risen saints, whether they will submit to his sway or not: That "they are to rule them with an iron sceptre, and dash them as vessels of clay,"

placed under the sway of the risen and glorified saints, and summoned to receive Christ as their Redeemer and king; and such as refuse submission to his sceptre, dashed in unsparing justice to death. The period that is to be occupied by this trial, may not improbably be that which is to elapse between the twelve hundred and ninety days and the thirteen hundred and thirty-five, Daniel xii. 11, 12.

That the risen saints are to be invested with such authority over the nations after Christ comes, and exercise such a rule, implies that they are to be exalted to an intelligence and rectitude far beyond their attainments in this life. No one now on the earth, however distinguished for uprightness and wisdom, has the slightest competence to such a task. It would bewilder and overwhelm those of the greatest understandings and purest hearts. To what greatness and perfection of intelligence must they be raised; to what purity, rectitude, and strength of affections, that they may exert an administration of such a nature over fallen fellow-beings without error, without prejudice, without weakness! To what a comprehensiveness of views, to what serenity of judgment, to what steadfastness in righteousness must they be exalted, that they can execute the sentence of Divine justice on the incorrigibly wicked, without perturbation; with a full and adoring approval of God in it, and with an unfaltering assurance that it will for ever be contemplated by holy beings with approbation, and redound to his glory and the welfare of his kingdom! The spirits of the redeemed are manifestly to be elevated to a strength and resplendence of powers as much above the scope of their faculties here, as their spiritual and immortal forms are to transcend in energy and beauty our present frail and mortal bodies.

This pledge of a kingly rule is followed by the promise: "And I will give to him the morning star." The morning star is the brilliant planet that ushers in the dawn. Christ denominates himself the bright and morning star (chap. xxii. 16). If it be used in this promise as his title, as it probably is, it denotes that he will yield the saint who is thus to rule the nations, the light by which he is to be guided in the great measures of judgment that are to introduce the universal righteousness and peace of his millennial reign on

the earth; and the promise would be essentially the same, if, which is less probable, the meaning were, that he would give him a light to guide him in the difficult scene in which he is to be called to act, that shall be to him what the morning star which heralds the dawn now is to men. These promises are thus of great significance and beauty. They reveal to us, perhaps clearer than any other passages, the great measures of mercy and judgment that are to mark the introduction of the new dispensation at Christ's second coming, and bespeak, in very striking forms, the greatness and majesty of nature to which the glorified saints are to be exalted, and the loftiness and wonderfulness of the offices in Christ's kingdom they are to fill.

To the messenger of the church in Sardis, Christ speaks as he who has the seven Spirits of God and the seven stars; and reminding him that though he has a name that he lives, he is dead, he commands him to rouse himself to watchfulness, and to repent, or he would come upon him in his carelessness. There were a few names, however, in Sardis that had not defiled their garments; who, he promises, shall walk

It is never to be questioned. That they are to be publicly presented to the Father, as thus justified, shows that they are to be accepted as such by him; and that that is to take place in the presence of the angels, implies that they are to be acquainted with each individual who is redeemed, and be able to make known the facts that distinguish each one's redemption to all the innumerable orders of intelligences to whom it is their office to unfold the wonders of God's righteousness and grace in the work of salvation. What immeasurable moment is thus to attach to those great acts of the Redeemer! What an epoch to the redeemed will their justification form! On what a new era will they then enter! To what ineffable peace and bliss will they be exalted! What glory will invest the endless ages of activity and love that are to follow!

To the messenger of the church of Philadelphia he speaks as he who is holy, who is true, who has the key of hades, who is opening and no one will shut, and is shutting and no one opens; and after commending him for not denying his name, and promising him, because he has kept the word of his patience, to keep him from the hour of trial which was coming on the whole world, he adds:

"He who overcomes, I will make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall no more go out. And I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the New Jerusalem, which comes out of heaven from my God, and my new name. He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches."

The temple of God is that vast structure formed of the risen and glorified saints, in which, as in a tabernacle, God is to dwell among men (chap. xxi. 3). As a pillar is one of the most important parts of a temple, both as a support and an ornament, to make one who overcomes a pillar in the temple of God, will be to give him a place of the greatest authority and dignity in that edifice of the redeemed. That he shall never go out of it, means that he shall hold that place of responsibility and honor not merely for a season, but for ever. That Christ will write on him the name of God, signifies that he will invest him with some badge, or impress on him some mark that will bespeak to all beholders his consecration to God, and acknowledgment

by him as one of his redeemed family. That he will write on him the name of the city of God, the New Jerusalem, means that he will distinguish him by some badge or mark that will show to all that he belongs to that body of the risen and glorified saints who are symbolized by the New Jerusalem, and called the Lamb's wife; and that he will write on him his new name, denotes that he will cause him to bear on his person some signal or token of his relationship to him as one of his redeemed. What Christ's new name is to be is not shown. It is probably that which is to be written on his brow, or diadem, at his second coming, which no one is to know but himself (chap. xix. 12), and indicating, therefore, not simply that his being is incomprehensible; but that his purposes of wisdom and love towards his redeemed transcend the grasp of creatures; and thence implying an inconceivableness and exhaustlessness of gifts he is to lavish on them. These promises thus speak, in a very impressive form, the beauty and glory of the relationship to God and Christ to which the redeemed are to be raised. They are to occupy stations of the greatest dignity and glory in

invested with kingly authority in Christ's kingdom, and take a part with him in conducting the holy and gracious administration over the world, under which all its nations and kindreds are to be brought to obey his will. And this is in accordance with the revelation, chap. xx. 4–6, that the risen and glorified saints are to sit on thrones and reign with him during the period denoted by the thousand years of Satan's imprisonment; and the prediction, Daniel vii. 18, 22, 27, that at Christ's second coming and reception of the earth as his empire, the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom and possess it for ever and ever. It is to be therefore one of the greatest and most wonderful of the proofs Christ is to give of the perfect restoration of the redeemed from the thraldom of sin, and enjoyment of his confidence in their righteousness, their wisdom, and their love. No more august expression of his approval and trust could be made, than that he is thus to associate them with himself in the rule of the world, and invest them with power, and assign them agencies that demand unerring intelligence, unfaltering rectitude, unfailing benignity. What a purification, enlargement, and sublimation of spirit it bespeaks! What vastness of knowledge! what spotlessness of justice and truth! what perfection of love! Who can contemplate it without awe at the dignities and glories that await us, without wonder and gratitude at the riches of Christ's grace!

These promises thus disclose to us in very impressive forms the love with which Christ is to regard his redeemed, and yield us glimpses clearer and more far-reaching than any others of the dignities, employments, and beatitudes that are to mark their endless existence. It was the greatness of the change that was thus to be wrought in their being and characters; it was the grandeur of the resemblance to Christ, the intimacy of relation to him, the dignity and the activity in his service, and the lofty bliss to which they were to be exalted, that made his coming and institution of his kingdom here the object of such earnest and almost impatient desire to the believers of the first age. How sadly has the church of late lost sight of these sublime futurities! Not only these august rewards with which the Redeemer is to crown those whom he is to glorify at his coming, but his coming itself, and reign *on the earth*, have fallen, in a great measure, from

the interest and the faith of multitudes who bear his name. The utterance breathed so earnestly from the apostle's lips, as he gazed on these approaching wonders, "Come, Lord Jesus," is now heard from only here and there one who looks for the "glorious appearance of our Saviour." If viewed aright, however, it would be desired as fervently by all, as it was by those in the first ages, to whom its glories were so fully disclosed. If the warning was at that time appropriate to the forgetful, how much more is it to the indifferent and unbelieving of this period, to whom his advent is so near? "Remember, therefore, how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast and repent. If, therefore, thou shouldst not watch, I will come to thee as a thief, and thou canst not know in what hour I will come to thee."

Art. IV.—The Indo-Syrian Church.

BY REV. J. FORSYTH, D.D.

Tradition relates that, after the ascension of our Lord, and the church had been fully established at Jerusalem, the apostles went forth to publish the glad tidings in the regions severally allotted to them by divine command, or by mutual arrangement. For example, Andrew, it is said, visited the shores of the Black sea; Bartholomew went to Arabia, Philip to Phrygia, and Thomas to India. How much or how little truth there may be in this story, cannot be ascertained. The New Testament is silent on the subject, beyond the general statement, that they "went every where preaching the word;" and the first century furnishes no witnesses who were personally cognizant of the facts. There is, however, nothing improbable in the supposition that some one of those heroic heralds of the gospel may have penetrated as far into the East, as others did into the West. In both directions there were teeming millions sitting in darkness, and commerce had opened well frequented pathways, rendering the Orient and the Occident equally accessible to the Christian evangelist.

That Thomas or any other apostle ever honored India with his presence may be questioned, but there is little room to doubt that the church was planted in India during the primitive ages of faith. In the second century there came to the Christians of Alexandria a cry for help so loud and urgent, that no less a man than Pantaenus, the founder of the renowned school of that city, and the teacher of Clemens, Origen, and others of the most eminent theologians of that age, was induced to spend some years of missionary labor in India. How long he remained in this country, and what were the fruits of his visit, are questions which we have no means of answering. We only know that he went to the East, and after some years returned to his old post in the Alexandrian school.*

A few centuries later, we have the testimony of an eye-witness to the fact that numerous churches existed on the west coast of Southern India, and in the Island of Ceylon, viz. that of Cosmas the topographer. He was an old sea captain of Alexandria, who had been for many years in the Indian trade, and had made many voyages to the far east. But wearying, at length, of the risks and perils of commerce and the ocean, he had sought a quiet resting-place in an Egyptian monastery, and he spent his latter years in writing a work entitled *Topographia Christiana*, in which, with much monkish nonsense, is mixed a great deal of the practical knowledge of a shrewd and observing traveller. "There is," says Cosmas, "in the island of Taprobane (Ceylon), a Christian church, with ministers and believers.—In the Malabar country, also, where pepper grows, there are Christians, and also in Calliana, as they call it, there is a bishop who comes from Persia, where he was ordained."

From the account of Cosmas, it also appears that at this period these Indian churches were, like himself, Nestorian in sympathy and opinion, if not in formal ecclesiastical connexion. We may consequently infer that they had retained, up to this time, the faith, the discipline, and the spiritual life of the primitive ages in a much larger measure than the domi-

* Dr. Burton thinks that Pantaenus went to Arabia; but there is, it seems to us, decisive proof that he went to India, in the writings of his favorite pupil, *Clemens Alex.—Stromata*, i., 529, Potter's ed.

nant churches of the West. During several succeeding centuries the Nestorians and the Jacobites spread themselves with a wonderful energy and success over the vast regions of central and eastern Asia, until their numbers, at one period, were computed to surpass both the Greek and Latin communions. They were not, indeed, exempt from the superstitions and the will worship of the so-called Catholic church; in these respects, they fell far below the Novatians, Paulicians, and other Puritans of those early centuries. Still, they must have had no small share of the living energy of true religion, since they exhibited so much missionary zeal, and so boldly unfurled the banner of the cross in the presence of barbarians and idolaters.*

The chief centres of Nestorian activity and influence were in Mesopotamia and Syria. In many of the great cities of those countries, *e. g.* Nisibis, Edessa, Seleucia, Babylon, there were Nestorian seminaries, whose alumni were sent forth to gather new churches from among the heathen, or to strengthen those already planted. This may serve to account for the Syrian character of the churches on the

Christian community, which hailed his arrival as that of a brother in the faith. Little did they dream that these "brethren," so cordially welcomed, before many years had passed, would subject them to forms of intolerant cruelty, such as neither Malay nor Moslem had ever dreamed of. De Gama made some conquests, and thus laid the foundations of Portuguese power in India, which was soon extended and compacted by Alphonso de Albuquerque, who captured Goa in 1510, and made it the capital of the eastern dominions of Portugal.

At this period the Malabar coast was divided among numerous petty princes. The chief traders were Mahomedans, who, though hardly amounting to a tithe of the general population, possessed great influence, and were much courted by the three most powerful rajahs of Colaster, Calicut, and Cochin. The Christians seem to have had, at one time, a prince of their own, who ruled over a considerable territory; but, though at the time of De Gama's arrival, they were the subjects of the native rajahs, they enjoyed various political immunities secured to them by a charter engraven on three tablets of brass. The Christian population must have amounted to several hundred thousand, as in one of the provinces occupied by them, they are said to have had fourteen hundred churches. They were, at all events, so numerous that they had a military force of their own, and if any of their various civil or social privileges were invaded, they did not hesitate to defend them by force of arms.

The whole region in which these Christians dwelt, and where their descendants are still found, is one of the richest and most delightful in the Indian peninsula. Except along the foot of the mighty Himalayas in the far north, in no part of Hindostan is the scenery more magnificent, or the climate more diversified—ranging, as it does, from that of the torrid to that of the temperate zone. The district is bounded on the east by the Neelgherry mountains, which lift their peaks some 8,000 feet above the sea level, and are now the great sanatarium of southern India. The face of the country between these mountains and the coast exhibits the most varied scene of hill, and dale, and winding streams, which clothe the valleys with perpetual verdure. The woods pro-

duce pepper, cinnamon, frankincense, and many other aromatic gums; while the sides of the mountains, almost to their very summits, are covered with forests of teak or the Indian-oak, the best ship timber in the world. "The first view of the Christian churches in the sequestered region of Hindostan," says Dr. Buchanan, who visited them in 1806, "connected with the idea of their tranquil duration for so many ages, cannot fail to excite pleasing emotions in the mind of the beholder. The form of the oldest buildings is not unlike that of some of the parish churches in England; the style in both being of Saracenic origin. They have sloping roofs, pointed arch windows, and buttresses supporting the walls. The beams of the roof being exposed to view, are ornamented; and the ceiling of the choir and altar is circular and fretted. Most of the churches are built of a reddish stone, squared and polished at the quarry, and are of durable construction; the front wall of the largest structures being six feet thick. The bells of the churches are cast in the foundries of the country; some of them are of large dimensions, and have inscriptions in Syriac and Malay-alim.

mental doctrines of orthodox Christianity, viz.:—1. Of the Trinity, as defined in the Athanasian creed, without the damnatory clauses. 2. Of the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit. 3. Of salvation by faith alone in the atoning sacrifice of Christ for the sins of men. Such is the substance of the creed of the ancient Malabar church; but her position will be better understood, and her affinity with the true Catholic church of all ages will be more distinctly discerned, when we consider the dogmas and usages which she *rejected.**

1. She did not recognise the *Pope's supremacy.* On the contrary, so soon as these Christians came to know the Roman church, they abhorred her as Antichristian, and utterly rejected the claims of the Pope to universal jurisdiction. Until the Portuguese landed they had never even heard of such a personage; and when they did learn that he assumed to be the vicar of God and head of the church on earth, they at once declared that he must be Antichrist.

2. She maintained that the *Church of Rome had corrupted the true faith,* by making the word of God of none effect, and by imposing many human inventions upon the consciences of men. The Malabar Christians stoutly resisted every Romish novelty, so long as they had any freedom to think and act for themselves.

3. She denied the dogma of *transubstantiation.* The books of the Syrian Christians, says Gouvea, the Portuguese historian, "contained enormous errors against this holy sacrament." These "enormous errors" consisted in their maintaining the *spiritual* presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist, and thus rejecting the notion of an *actual* presence as an absurd figment.

4. She condemned the *adoration of images as idolatry.* Except the figure of a cross, not an image was to be found in any of the Syrian churches prior to the arrival of De Gama.

5. She knew nothing of the *intercession of saints.* She held that the souls of departed saints are in a state of happiness, but will not appear in the presence of God until

* The records of the Synod of Diamper, from which our facts are gathered, will be found in *Hough's History of Christianity in India,* ii. 23–129.

after the resurrection. Gouvea, of course, pronounces this "an enormous error," striking, as it does, at the root of a dogma, which has brought millions of money into the treasury of Rome.

6. She had never so much as heard of *purgatory*, and could not comprehend what the Popish priests meant, when they talked about it.

7. She, of course, knew as little of *masses and prayers for the dead.*

8. She had no knowledge of *extreme unction.*

9. She had never heard of *auricular confession;* and when the thing was first proposed to her members, they shrank from it with the utmost horror, as they well might.

10. Her *clergy married* as freely as laymen; and the wives of the former were held in such honor, that they took precedence of all other women on all occasions, and in all places.

11. She recognised only *two sacraments*, viz. baptism and the *Lord's supper.*

12. In baptism there was no *holy oil* used, but water

17. She recognised only *two orders in the ministry*, viz. presbyters or priests, and deacons.*

There are various other usages, some of them being retained by the church of England as relics of those five or six centuries which she designates as "primitive antiquity," *e. g. Bowing at the name of Jesus*, with which the Indo-Syrian churches were wholly unacquainted.

Such were the faith and the order of the church of Malabar viewed on their negative side; and, when we take into account the truths she maintained, as well as the errors she rejected, we are warranted in saying that she was one of the purest branches of the church in mediæval times. If her

* It is surprising that so good a man as Dr. Claudius Buchanan, in his excessive zeal for prelatic episcopacy, should have allowed himself to make, first, a disingenuous statement on this point, and next, a misrepresentation of a fact attested by the Romish ecclesiastics. In the first edition of his Christian Researches, p. 148, he says "that these Hindoo Christians maintained the *order and discipline of a regular church under Episcopal jurisdiction.*" Then, on p. 149, he gives a list of errors abjured by the Syrian clergy at the Synod of Diamper. Among these "errors," he says, was this, "that they had no other orders or names of dignity in the church *than bishop, priest, and deacon.*" Now, this last is a positive misstatement, proved to be such by the Records of the Synod; and we can only account for the fact by supposing that Dr. B. got his information at second-hand, or quoted from memory. In the third session of the Synod of Diamper, various old Syrian books are condemned, and ordered to be destroyed—among which was "the Book of Orders, wherein it is said that there *are only two orders, diaconate and priesthood.*" The Indo-Syrians, who were unsubdued by Rome, and whom Dr. B. visited in 1806, confessed to him "that they were in a degenerate state compared with their forefathers"—that "customs had been introduced in the later centuries" which were unknown in the older and purer times. Yet Dr. B. testifies that he found "*ruling elders*"—*i. e.* lay elders, as they are sometimes called—in these Syrian churches. The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Diamper prove conclusively that the "order and discipline of a regular Episcopal church" were unknown until then; for one of the chief objects of this Synod was to set up such an order and discipline.

Dr. Buchanan's attention was called to the misstatement noticed above, and in a subsequent edition of the Christian Researches he corrected it, as we have been assured, though unable to verify the fact by a personal examination of it. But, after his death, somebody took it upon him to cancel the correction, and restore the old misrepresentation to its place!

Mr. Hough, though an Episcopalian, candidly states the case as it is (*Hist.* ii. 16); but he adds, in a note, with a charming simplicity, "it does not appear why the order of *bishops* is omitted here." He then proceeds to "conjecture" the cause of the puzzling phenomenon.

membership had been placed in circumstances similar to those of the faithful mountaineers of Piedmont, her history would, no doubt, have been as mournful and as glorious as theirs. But persecution unto death was one of the trials of faith and love, to which she does not appear to have been subjected, for some centuries prior to the advent of the Portuguese.

It will naturally be asked, what was the influence upon the Indo-Syrian church herself, of the faith and polity to which she nominally adhered? How did her interior condition compare with her creed? The destruction of her ancient archives by the ruthless bigotry of Rome renders it impossible to give so full and satisfactory an answer to this question as could be desired. Still the unwitting testimony of her enemies shows that here as everywhere else the world over, the truth in Jesus vindicated its divinity by its influence on the moral character and social condition of those who professed it. The Syrian Christians were distinguished from all the other inhabitants of the Malabar coast, by physical as well as moral traits; they are said to

It may be said, that however pure the creed of the Indo-Syrian church, her spiritual life must have been at a low ebb, as we have no evidence of that aggressiveness which is one of the invariable marks of a healthy Christianity. The pure gospel, where it comes with power, is like leaven; its law is diffusion; it perpetually seeks to make inroads on the kingdom of darkness, and to bring men into its own marvellous light, even at the risk of bonds and death. This is true. And we know too, that a rigid orthodoxy may exist, while there is much more of formalism than practical godliness among those who profess it. So it may have been, so it no doubt *was* to some extent with the church in question. Yet when we remember the history of modern missions, especially of those within Mohammedan countries, we should not be surprised that the Syrian church did not attempt to win fresh conquests for the cross, in the presence of two such mighty powers of darkness as Brahminism and Islamism. We have never heard of a missionary in any part of the Turkish empire, making any direct effort for the conversion of a Mohammedan, until the recent enactment of a law of toleration. We once asked an eminent person connected with the missions to the east, how this was to be explained. "Why," said he, "to ask such a man to become a Christian, was, in effect, to ask him to lose his head." And therefore, unless we censure ourselves, we cannot harshly judge the Syrian church of India, if, in her circumstances, she regarded the door of missionary enterprise as shut, and concluded that the utmost she could hope to do, was to maintain her own ground, and hold fast her own integrity.

For nearly half a century after their settlement on the coast of Malabar, the Portuguese were too intent upon trade, and too eager in the pursuit of money and pleasure, to think much about the recovery of heretics, or the subjugation of the heathen to the dominion of Holy church. Even the friars, whom the government with a pious zeal worthy of a better cause, took care to send to these new settlements in the east, caught the spirit of the place, and were far more anxious to build and endow splendid convents for their various orders, than to win converts to the Christian faith. Hence when Francis Xavier landed at

Goa, in 1542, he discovered that his own countrymen were as fit objects of his missionary labors as the heathen themselves. In fact, they were utterly demoralized; and Xavier must have felt, that it was a preposterous task to undertake the conversion of Pagan or Moslem to a religion whose professors indulged in vices of which even the heathen were ashamed.

The first attempts to bring the Malabar Christians into the communion of Rome were made in 1545, by the Cordeliers of the order of St. Francis. Don Juan Albuquerque, the first bishop of Goa, was a member of this order, and having had his attention turned to these churches, he sent a friar, named Vincent, whom the historian Gouvea describes as "a great man of God," to inquire into their condition, and to induce them, if possible, to recognise the Papal supremacy. Father Vincent was welcomed by them as a Christian minister, and was allowed to preach in their churches until they comprehended the real object of his visit. Finding that he could neither coax nor coerce the *cattanars*, as the Syrian pastors were called, he changed his

way was opened for their using against her that old weapon, "divide and conquer," which they have so often employed, on so many fields, and with such deadly effect. Believing that they could make an easy conquest of the flock if its chief pastor, Mar Joseph, were out of the way, a plot was contrived to secure this end, and he was accordingly sent to Portugal, with the understanding that he should not be allowed, on any condition, to return to the east. Mar Joseph, like St. Peter at Antioch, seems to have "dissembled" somewhat at Lisbon. At all events, the managers in Portugal, being satisfied with his soundness in the faith, or misunderstanding the orders from Goa, sent him back to his old post. Meanwhile a Syrian successor, Mar Abraham, had taken possession of the ground, and thus the door was opened for Jesuitism to work for the accomplishment of its designs, in its own peculiar way. Advantage was taken of the mutual rivalry of these two men, neither of whom possessed the unbending integrity and heroic courage which, at this juncture, were the qualities pre-eminently needed in the leaders of the Syrian church. Both of them appear to have acted on the principle of "doing at Rome as the Romans do," of dealing with Jesuits as Jesuits deal with others. They, however, soon found, to their sorrow, that they were rude tyros in the hands of masters perfectly accomplished in all the arts of chicanery and intrigue. Poor Mar Joseph, by recognising the Pope, and by coming back to India under Papal authority, had allowed himself to be taken in a Jesuit net. Fancying that his difficulties were at an end, after his return from Portugal, he began to preach to his people their old Syrian faith, but he was speedily roused from his dream by an imperious summons to appear at Goa and answer to the charge of heresy. He was foolish enough to obey, and it is said that he was sent to Rome, but his fate is one of the mysteries of history.

The chief instrument in bringing the portion of the Syrian church which finally succumbed, under the yoke of Rome, was Menezes, Archbishop of Goa. He arrived in India in 1597, armed with all the Papal powers necessary to effect the conquest. But his first efforts did not promise much. Mar Abraham, who had been exalted to the high dignity of (Romish) Archbishop of Angamale, showed signs of relapse

to the old Syrian faith very soon after he had reached his "see;" and as death approached, he threw off all disguise. The measures adopted by Menezes, in regard to the succession, so inflamed the Syrian churches that they held what we would call a "convention" of their cattanars, or pastors, and ruling elders, at which it was resolved that they would steadfastly adhere to their ancient faith and discipline, and that no Romish priest should be admitted into their churches. They, in fact, entered into a covenant to defend the liberties of the church of their fathers, and all present bound themselves, by a solemn oath, to adhere to it. And if, at this time, they had possessed a leader of unflinching courage, of unwavering principle—one who, with intelligence and piety combined a thorough comprehension of the crafty foe with whom he had to contend, these Syrians might have opposed their enemy with success, and perhaps have won a world-wide fame as the Covenanters of India.

Finding that his negotiations with the Syrians were not yielding much fruit, he determined to visit them in person. The viceroy and clergy of Goa, alarmed for his safety among those whose hostility he had done so much to excite

Cochin, where he was received by the authorities with all honor, and sent a message to the Syrian archdeacon to meet him at this place, that they might confer together in regard to the affairs of the church.

The poor Syrians hardly knew what to do in this emergency, when their Cattanars and principal laymen were called together for consultation by the archdeacon. They were afraid for their pepper trade, they were afraid for their religion, they were afraid to comply with the summons of Menozes, they were afraid to offend him. A sort of compromise was concluded. The archdeacon, under a strong escort, should go to Cochin; and the archbishop, if he came among them, should be allowed to say mass in their churches, but if he attempted to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he was to be sturdily opposed. Menozes, of course, intended to visit them. He did so. He went to Vappicotta, and preached a sermon there from John x. 1, in which he tried to show that none were true pastors but those who entered by "the door" of the Roman church. Gouvea says that this sermon was so full of pious sentiments as "to draw tears from the eyes of Portuguese and natives." The latter may have wept, but it is probable that their tears were produced by the dreaded power rather than by the "piety" of the preacher.

After he had propounded to the Syrians the startling doctrine that their venerated Cattanars or Pastors were "thieves and robbers," Menozes desired them to assemble the next day that he might administer to them the rite of Confirmation—a rite, of which they were up to this time wholly ignorant, and one, which they evinced no desire to accept. He also explained to them on this occasion the doctrine of Purgatory, of which they had never before heard. The only real converts he made at Vappicotta were two Syrian youths, whom the Jesuits were training for the priesthood. Overcome by the seductive kindness of Menozes, they became the open, and apparently the sincere adherents of Rome. His success was insignificant in point of numbers; but the thin edge of the wedge was inserted, which, in due time, he was certain that he could drive triumphantly home. He next went to Paree—the capital of a province containing a large body of Syrian Christians,

who had already manifested a decided repugnance to Popery, both to its doctrines and its practices.

Menozes was received by the Syrians of Parce with a cold respect, and was allowed the use of their churches and pulpits. They listened in silence to his sermons; but when he urged them to be "confirmed," their patience was exhausted, and they vehemently cried out that they would never submit to the indignity of being confirmed by him;—that it was no sacrament, nor in any sense one of Christ's institutions, but an invention of the Portuguese to make them slaves, by "setting a mark on their foreheads and giving them a box on the ear;—that they would not endure it, nor allow him to touch their own beards, or their wives' and daughters' faces. We have not space to follow the Romish archbishop from place to place, and to describe the treatment with which he met. The failure of his mission was so obvious, and the insults to which he was occasionally exposed were so displeasing to the Portuguese, that they begged him to abandon the field and return home.

But with a zeal worthy of a better cause he persisted in

the old rule of the council of Lateran, that no one is bound to keep an engagement made with heretics.

We cannot, within the limits of an article, describe the successive steps and the various methods by which the crafty and unprincipled prelate accomplished his designs; how he worked upon the fears of the native rajahs, and bribed the Syrians with money, or dazzled them with pompous ceremonies, or terrified them with threats. It must suffice to say that the poor archdeacon was finally brought to throw himself at the feet of Menozes, and to utter the confession as hypocritical as it was blasphemous: —"Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight," etc., and to promise that he would subscribe a certain creed which Menozes had drawn up. Before subscribing the creed, the archdeacon suggested that on account of certain Christians not so well instructed as they should be, and until the meeting of the synod soon to be called, it would be best that his subscription should be in private. Menozes deemed it prudent to comply; but as he had good reason to regard his convert's faith as very slender and unsettled, he took special care to guard against the ill consequences of a subsequent recantation.

The synod, which it was agreed to hold for the adjustment of all matters of doctrine and discipline, is known in history as the *Synod of Diamper*—a town not far from the Portuguese garrison of Cochin, and selected by Menozes for this very reason. It assembled on the 20th June, 1599, and consisted of 173 ecclesiastics and 660 procurators of the people; and it remained in session nine days. It was opened with a solemn mass by the archbishop in person. But it is unnecessary to detail its proceedings. It is enough to say that its declared purpose was "the extirpation of errors and heresies out of the Malabar church," and its final result was to force Romanism upon all who were driven or deluded into an acceptance of its decrees. All persons who had anything to "propose for the glory of God, and the reformation of the church," were invited to come forward; but Menozes, who was the presiding genius of the occasion, was too shrewd to submit their proposals to a free discussion and a free vote. Worthless, in one view, as the decrees of the Synod of Diamper therefore are, in another aspect

they are of great value—they show what popery is, and what the old Indo-Syrian church was.

The solemn farce was terminated by the public and formal adoption of the decrees, or their subscription by the ecclesiastics and laymen who had "assisted" at the synod. This was not accomplished without opposition by the unwilling Cattanars, but their hostility was overcome by the gifts and the threats of the archbishop, and last and best of all, by a *miracle* which Gouvea describes and attests. A heavy rain had been falling for some days, and the weather was such that it seemed as if the procession could not leave the church within which it was sheltered. The person holding the crucifix stepped to the door, and alarmed by the descending flood, said it was manifest that the union just made was displeasing to God. Menozes, however, ordered the procession to move, when, "no sooner was the cross taken from the porch than, marvellous to relate, the rain ceased, and the weather became the finest in the world." Not a man was wet, not even the cross-bearer who headed the procession: the murmurs of the Cattanars were hushed by the

became little better than that of their Romanized brethren. In 1663 the death-blow was given to the Portuguese power in India by the Dutch. Cochin was captured, and the hopes of the poor Syrians were greatly raised by this event; but the Dutch on the Malabar coast were too much occupied with other affairs to concern themselves about the native Christians. A glorious opportunity was thus lost for winning real conquests to the Cross in that dark land. The Indo-Syrian church gradually assumed the form and position in which we now find it—that is to say, it was divided into two reciprocally hostile branches, one of which recognises, while the other refuses, the supremacy of Rome.

The attention of English Christians was first turned to these distant and ancient churches in 1724, and the missionaries of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge were directed to inquire into the state of the Syrians, with a view to their employment as helpers in the work of evangelizing India. It was hoped that they would be important allies in the blessed enterprise of winning the Indies to Christ. But it was soon found that, instead of lending aid to spread the light, they were in much need of the light themselves. Although opposed to wearing the yoke of Rome, they were not exempt from that evil leaven of superstition which had made Rome what she is. This attempt to enlist the co-operation of the Indo-Syrian church, and to strengthen the things that remained in her and were ready to die, was, perhaps, too soon abandoned, and the Reformed churches of the West became even oblivious of her existence, until the publication of Dr. Buchanan's Christian Researches, in 1808. For more than twenty years English missionaries have been at work among the children of these ancient churches; and we would fondly hope that, though so long dormant, they may yet be aroused to win for themselves a share in the coming glories of that day when the banner of the Cross shall wave in triumph over all these magnificent regions, from the spicy groves of Ceylon to the snowy summits of the Himalayas.

Art. V.—A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters XLIX., L., and LI.

A new series of prophecies now begins that treat especially of the Messiah, his appointment by God to his office, the reception he was to meet from men, his death in expiation of sin, his glorification, the rejection the glad tidings of his work were for a time to meet; the submission at length of the Israelites and the Gentiles to his sway, and the final redemption and blessedness of the world under his reign.

Chapter XLIX. The prophet first announces to the distant nations the appointment of the Messiah to his office, and intimates that for a time his true nature is to be concealed from the eyes of men, vs. 1–3. The Messiah then predicts that his labors in that state to bring men to salvation, were to prove fruitless, vs. 4. Jehovah responds, that the Messiah, though so unsuccessful with the Israelites, will yet be glorified; that the redemption of the Gentiles that is to be accomplished by him, is to be of far higher moment than

2. Metonymy of islands for their inhabitants. The islands addressed were those of the west, with which the Israelites were familiar. It is the Messiah who speaks; the Gentiles are the nations whom he addresses, and his announcement is, that he is to be of human birth, and that he is from the first moment of his life to be called of God and consecrated to his office.

3. Comparison. "And he has placed (made) my mouth like a sharp sword," vs. 2. The resemblance of his mouth to a sharp sword, was in the office it was to fill: as the instrument of destruction. As a sharp sword is the implement of wounds and death to those who are struck by it, so the truths Christ was to proclaim by his mouth, and the sentences he was to utter against his enemies, were to carry death to them. And this accords with the import of a sharp two-edged sword proceeding from his mouth, Rev. xix. 21, as the instrument by which he slew his enemies at the great battle of God Almighty at Armageddon. It indicates, accordingly, that one great office the Messiah was to fill, was to reprove and condemn hostile men.

4. Hypocatastasis. "In the shadow of his hand he hid me," vs. 2. "Hiding in the shadow of his hand," is put for concealing his nature and purpose in a measure, or withholding him from the full manifestation of himself and exercise of his functions, and signifies especially that he was not at first to act in his sphere as Judge and executor of vengeance on his enemies.

5. Comparison. "And he placed (made) me as a polished arrow," v. 2. Here his whole person—not his mouth or hand simply—is compared to a polished arrow. The likeness, as before, consists in the office he is to fill as executor of judgment: and implies that he is to be to his enemies, what a polished arrow, that is, an arrow with a sharp metallic point, is to an enemy who is pierced by it.

6. Hypocatastasis. "In his quiver he has hid me," vs. 2. Hiding in that mode, is put for concealing his office as avenger, by delaying his entrance on it; and signifies that the Messiah was for a time withheld from his functions as Judge and destroyer, and like an arrow that is laid up in a quiver, for use, when needed, was to be reserved for that part of his work, to a day at a considerable distance from

his birth. And these predictions were verified in his ministry. His Deity and Messiahship were almost wholly hidden from men for thirty years from his birth, and the great acts he is to exert of judging and inflicting vengeance on his enemies, were postponed to his second coming.

"And he said unto me, Thou art my servant, Warrior of God, in whom I will be glorified," vs. 3. That the name Israel, should here be rendered according to its literal sense Warrior of God, not as the denominative of the people descended from Jacob, admits, we think, of no reasonable debate. It is applied to him as descriptive of his office as Judge and avenger of his enemies, already indicated by the comparison of his mouth to a sharp sword, and his whole person to a polished arrow, and ascribed to him in the vision in the Apocalypse, in which he is exhibited as coming to judge and make war, with a sharp sword proceeding from his mouth, with which he smites the nations and slays the remnant of his enemies, xix. 11, 15, 21.

This use of the term is legitimate. It is applied to Jacob. It is natural, suited to the occasion and context, and

The Messiah now responds to this assurance that Jehovah shall be glorified in him. "And I said, I have labored in vain; for naught and vanity I have spent my strength. But my right is with Jehovah, and my cause with my God," vs. 4. This is a prediction, doubtless, of the ill-success of his ministry with Israel at his first advent. His labors to bring that people to an acknowledgment and acceptance of him as the Messiah were vain. The priests, the rulers, and the people, instead of receiving, rejected him, and put him to death as an impostor and blasphemer in arrogating the title and office of the Messiah. That rejection, however, was no proof of his ultimate failure in his work. His right as Messiah was with Jehovah, and his work with him, to be recognised, and vindicated, and made efficacious at a future time.

7. Hypocatastasis, in the substitution of eyes for the mind, or person. "And now saith Jehovah (who formed me from the womb to be a servant to himself, to restore Jacob to him; and Israel is not gathered; and yet I shall be honored in the eyes of Jehovah, and my God is my strength); he said: It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel. I have given thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that my salvation may be to the end of the earth," vs. 5, 6.

8. Metaphor, in denominating the Messiah a light.

The restoration of Israel was to be but a slight part of the work the Messiah was to accomplish. His purposes of mercy towards the Gentiles were far more extensive. He was to be the Sun of Righteousness to them; shedding the light of redemption on their darkness, and extending the blessings of salvation to the most distant of their tribes.

Though, to be ignominiously rejected, at his advent, by the priests and rulers of the Israelites, a short time only was to pass ere he was to be accepted and acknowledged by other potentates of the earth. "Thus saith Jehovah, the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, to him who is despised in soul, to him whom the nation abhors; to a subject of rulers; kings shall see and rise up; princes, and bow themselves, for the sake of Jehovah, who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel who has chosen thee," vs. 7. The Messiah is the person who was to be vehemently despised and abhor-

red; and the Israelites the nation who were to despise and abhor him. Rising up is the act by which kings express their homage, and bowing that by which princes pay theirs. These acts of acknowledgment and submission were to be for the sake of Jehovah, who is faithful, the Holy one of Israel, who has chosen the Messiah; that is, they were on the one hand to spring from the conviction that the Messiah is truly the person whom Jehovah has appointed to be the Redeemer of the world; and, on the other hand, they were to be in order to the verification of Jehovah's predictions and promises. Having, in the covenant with the Redeemer, pledged the submission of the rulers of the world to his sceptre, he will, for the sake of his faithfulness, accomplish it. These predictions began to be fulfilled at the first promulgation of the gospel, and have received a vast verification through eighteen hundred years.

The time is to come, however, when the promise of the redemption of Israel shall also be accomplished.

9. Hypocatastasis, in the substitution of raising up the earth for restoring it from its ruin. "Thus saith Jehovah,

springs of water shall he lead them," vs. 9, 10. This prediction is parallel to chap. xxxv. 6, 7, xli. 18, and xliii. 19. They are not to be conducted through deserts like those at the south, east, and north-east of Palestine; but waters are to gush forth in those wastes, and the wilderness is to be set with groves and forests, and changed to verdure and fruitfulness, that they may find food, and their flocks and herds pasturage at every stage of their journey.

"And I will make all my mountains for the way, and my roads shall be high," vs. 11. Mountains, instead of continuing to be barriers, will be so changed that the returning hosts shall traverse them; and the roads across vales and gorges thrown up so as to be safely and easily passed. There is a similar prediction, chap. xxxv. 8. Their restoration from their exile, like their deliverance from Egypt, is to be attended by stupendous miracles, that shall show, in the most emphatic manner, that he is their Redeemer, and impress the nations with awe.

"And behold these shall come from afar; and behold these from the north, and from the sea, and these from the land of Sinim," vs. 12. This restoration is to be universal. By those who are to come from afar, may be meant those who are to come from parts of the earth then, and for ages after, unknown to the Hebrews, such as this continent, and the isles of the Pacific and Southern oceans, more remote from Palestine than any of the countries of Europe, Asia, or Africa, with which they were acquainted. Those from the sea, and the north, are those of the south coast of the Mediterranean, Europe, Western and North-western Asia; and those from the land of Sinim, or China, as is supposed by many, those from the remote east.

11, 12, 13. Personifications in summoning the heavens, earth, and mountains to acts and affections that are proper only to intelligent beings. "Shout O heavens, and rejoice O earth, and let the mountains burst into song; for Jehovah has comforted his people, and he will have mercy on his afflicted," vs. 13. This is an instance in which the apostrophe and the personification are united in the same expressions. This is to be an occasion of the greatest joy and thankfulness. All nature is to share in it. The joy is not to be expressive of exultation simply. It is to be a song of

gratitude, of adoring ascriptions to God of power, and wisdom, and faithfulness, and mercy; all nations are to share in it. It is to be the chant of a wondering, admiring, and rejoicing world.

14. Metonymy of Zion for the people of God residing there. "And (yet) Zion said, Jehovah has forsaken me, and the Lord has forgotten me." vs. 14. This is a prediction of the discouragement and anguish of the true worshippers among the Israelites during the period that was to pass from the several dispersions of that nation to their final restoration by the Messiah. They were uttered by Jeremiah in his Lamentations over the ruin of Jerusalem, and the captivity of her people by the Babylonians; and by Asaph, Psalm lxxiv. 1–11, lxxvii. 7–9; and they are exhibited by Isaiah as uttered by the nation generally, chap. xl. 27, "Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, my way is hid from Jehovah, and my judgment will pass away from my God." And this will be the feeling probably of the Israelites who return to Jerusalem, and who will be disappointed for a time in the expectation that the Messiah

of the nation as having already returned to Jerusalem, according to Zechariah xiv. 1, 2, and the city as still infested by enemies, who had conquered and wasted it.

16, 17. Comparison. "Lift up thine eyes round about and see; all of them are gathered together; they are come to thee. As I live, saith Jehovah, all of them thou shalt put on as an ornament, and bind them like the bride," vs. 18. The restoration is to be spontaneous and universal; and all who return are to be received as welcome and honorable accessions. They are to be to those who first return, or who occupy the capital, what her marriage dress is to a bride—an ornament that sets off her beauty, and bespeaks the dignity and joyousness of the new relation, on which she is entering.

"For thy ruins, and thy wastes, and thy land of desolation (that is desolated, large as it is) it shall be too narrow for the inhabitants; and thy devourers shall be far away. Again shall they—thy sons who wast childless—say to thee: The place is too narrow for me. Come near (to each other; making room) that I may dwell," vs. 19, 20. The sons of the childless one, are the sons of "the daughter of Zion," who from the slaughter and exile of her sons, thought herself childless. This passage is a fatal obstacle to their constructions who attempt to allegorize the return of the Israelites as a mere representative of their conversion, or the conversion of the Gentiles. It is absurd to suppose the church or the kingdom of heaven too narrow to accommodate those who are to be converted in the first years of the millennium. And what, moreover, on that view, can the ruins and wastes, and desolate tracts of Palestine signify? Are there any analogous wastes in Christ's heavenly kingdom? Are there to be any in his millennial church, when all nations are to come and worship him, and all individuals, from the least to the greatest, are to know him?

"And thou (the daughter of Zion—the inhabitants of the capital) shalt say in thine heart; who has begotten these for me? I was bereaved and barren; an exile and a banished one. And these, who brought up? Behold, I was left alone: These, where were they?" vs. 21. The speaker here is the daughter of Zion: that is the population of Jerusalem, considered as the mother of the nation; her sons are the exiles, returning from distant countries, and occupying the

wastes and desolate places of the Holy Land, of whose existence she had had no knowledge before. She is astonished at their multitude, greatly transcending what she had supposed must be the limits of such an exiled and blighted nation; and wonders where such thronging hosts can have been reared. It is to make a sad plunge into the absurd, to convert this inimitable picture of the surprise and wonder of the people of Jerusalem at the numbers of their nation who are to fill their land at this final restoration from dispersion, into utterances of astonishment by the redeemed in the skies at the crowds of Israelites or Gentiles who shall be converted at the first preaching of the gospel, or the commencement of Christ's millennial reign, and expressions of uncertainty, respecting the author of their renovation! Yet this is but one of countless inaptitudes and solecisms in which they involve themselves who attempt by allegorization to wrest this and other similar passages from the prediction of the restoration of Israel, to a prophecy of the entrance of Gentiles into the Christian church. On their theory, Christ's kingdom in its highest form, whether on earth or

thee; and shall lick the dust of thy feet," vs. 23. Acting as nursing fathers and nursing mothers is put for exercising an analogous care of tenderness and love that is suitable to the sphere of kings and queens. Bowing with the face to the earth is used to denote the most reverential homage; and licking the dust of the feet, the abject submission which conquered enemies are compelled to render. This indicates that the signals by which Jehovah is to call the nations to aid in restoring his people to their land are to be such as to impress them with the fullest conviction that the exiles whom he calls are indeed his chosen people, and to cause them to be regarded with awe and submission, as exalted to peculiar relations to God, and invested with prerogatives above all others. No such homage could be paid to persons who had no other distinction than that they were renewed by the Spirit, and had become members of the Christian church.

"And thou shalt know that I am Jehovah, and that they who trust in him shall not be ashamed," vs. 23. The visible manifestations Jehovah the Messiah will make of himself, and the miracles of power, wisdom, and love he will work in the redemption and re-establishment of the Israelites in their national land, will be such as to impress the inhabitants of Zion and all with the profoundest conviction that he is Jehovah; and the full and wondrous verification of all his promises to his covenant people will inspire them with a lofty and adoring realization, that they can never be disappointed who put their trust in him.

24. Comparison of drunkenness by blood with drunkenness by wine. "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty; and shall the captivity of the righteous (the righteous captives) be delivered? For thus saith Jehovah, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered; and I will contend with those who contend with thee, and I will save thy sons; and I will make thy oppressors eat their (own) flesh: and as with new wine they shall be drunken with their blood. And all flesh shall know that I Jehovah am thy Saviour, and that thy Redeemer is the Mighty One of Jacob," vs. 24–26. This indicates that the inhabitants of Jerusalem here addressed are, at the time of their redemption, to be in the hand of

powerful and oppressive conquerors, according to the prediction (Zech. xiv. 12–15), and that they are to be delivered by a terrible overthrow and slaughter of their enemies, as is foreshown in that prophecy, in Isaiah lxvi. 15–17, and Rev. xix. 11–21. This prophecy is, in like manner, incapable of allegorization. For what can oppressors eating their own flesh, and becoming drunk with their blood, denote in a spiritual relation? And who are the mighty from whom the captives are to be taken, and the terrible from whom the prey is delivered, if the deliverance is merely spiritual, and by regeneration? Is Satan the captor; and is he the oppressor who is to eat his own flesh and become drunk with his own blood? Such are the revolting errors in which they entangle themselves who attempt to put aside the grammatical sense, and substitute an allegorical one in its place.

The prophecy thus stretches over the period from the first to the second advent, foreshowing the birth of the Messiah; his office of avenger; his rejection by Israel; the offer of salvation to the Gentiles, and its acceptance by

the bill of your mother's divorcement, whom I have put away: or who is he among my creditors to whom I have sold you?" vs. 1. Divorcing and selling, acts of a husband towards a wife, are put for an analogous rejection by God of Israel as his chosen people. The question implies that the Israelites had charged God with rejecting them, instead of their having revolted from him, and exhibited their apostasies and their miseries as the consequence of his having violated his covenant, in place of their spontaneous revolt.

3. Metaphor in the use of mother.—Those whom the Messiah addresses are those who were to enjoy his ministry at his incarnation; and those whom he denominates their mother, the generation from whom they descended, that first apostatized; their ancestors in revolt and in rejection by the Most High.

4, 5, 6. Metaphors in the use of sold, mother, and put away.—"Behold, for your sins have ye been sold; and for your transgressions has your mother been put away," vs. 1. Sold and putting away—acts of a husband towards a wife, are used by a metaphor to express the analogous acts of Jehovah in inflicting and punishing their ancestors who first revolted from him and reared their children in rebellion.

"Why did I come, and there was no man? (Why) did I call, and there was none that answered?" vs. 2. This refers, doubtless, to the rejection Christ was to meet in his mission to the Israelites at his incarnation. "He came to his own (chosen people), and his own (as a people) received him not." The rulers of the nation publicly and officially rejected him, and denounced him as a false Messiah.

7. Hypocatastasis.—"Is my hand shortened—shortened that I cannot redeem? And is there with me no power to deliver?" vs. 2. Shortening the hand, by which it would be inadequate to reach an object, or handle it with effect, is put for inability. Had they rejected him because he was unable to save them? No; his power is unlimited.

"Behold in my rebuke I will dry up the sea. I make rivers a desert. Let their fish dry for want of water, and die of thirst," vs. 2. It was he who wrought similar miracles at the Red Sea, and at Jordan, in the march of the Israelites to Canaan, and he is to have the like power at his advent over all the realms of nature.

8. Metaphor in the use of clothe.—"I will clothe the heavens in blackness," vs. 3. That is, they shall be black.

9. Hypocatastasis in the use of sackcloth in place of the hues of mourning or sadness.—"And sackcloth I will make their covering," vs. 3. That is, he will intercept the light of the sun, and fill the skies with a gloom that shall be to the world what sackcloth is to the chastened and sorrowing who wear it. This answers to the prediction of the darkening of the sun at his second coming. Matt. xxiv. 29, 30.

10, 11. Hypocatastases in the substitution of the tongue for the persuasive address of the learned, and of wakening,—that is, rousing the ear, for rousing the mind to attention. "The Lord Jehovah has given me the tongue of the learned. He will waken in the morning, in the morning he will waken for me the ear, that I may hear like the taught," vs. 4. That is, that I may listen with the attention of those who are receiving knowledge. The Messiah here speaks of himself during his ministry, and in vindication of himself from the charge he was to meet from the Jewish priests and rulers, that he was not the Christ, nor a messenger from

not a complex person, as some assume; and that the other parts of the prophecy in which he speaks of himself, are to be interpreted as exclusively relating to him; not to Israel, as those interpreters imagine, or to the Christian church, of which he is the head.

14. Comparison. "And the Lord Jehovah will help me. Therefore I am not confounded. Therefore have I set my face as a flint. And I know that I shall not be ashamed," vs. 7. The consciousness of Jehovah's approval and support was to sustain him under that ignominious treatment from men. He was to be sure, in the darkest moments of his trial and humiliation, of his acceptance by Jehovah, and final vindication from the dishonors that were heaped upon him.

15, 16. Hypocatastases, in the use of stand up together and draw near, for an appeal to the Judge. "Near is my justifier. Who will contend with me? Let us stand up together. Who is my adversary? Let him draw near to me," vs. 8. This is a prediction that his cause was to be perfectly clear; that no one would oppose him whose testimony would bear a scrutiny. And this was verified at his trial, when none but false witnesses could be obtained to accuse him of evil; and his condemnation was founded on his avowal of the fact that he was the Messiah.

17. Comparison. "Behold, the Lord Jehovah will help me. Who is he that will condemn me? All they, like the garment, shall grow old. The moth shall devour them," vs. 9.

18. Hypocatastasis, in the substitution of moth for an analogous agent, or cause, that should destroy them. Though, in their triumph they should seem, to the eye of man, to be stronger than the Messiah, whom they put to death, yet their apparent victory would be but for a moment. Their subordination to him, and their helplessness would soon appear. They would waste away and perish under the resistless influence of the destroying causes to which the curse of sin subjected them, as garments that are old are consumed by the insects that prey on them; a prophecy that met a fearful verification in the destruction of a large share of the rejectors and murderers of the Messiah, in the insurrections and wars by which, in the reigns of Nero and Vespasian, *Jerusalem was* ravaged, and at length overthrown.

19, 20, 21. Hypocatastases, in the substitution of darkness and no light for the analogous want of knowledge; and leaning upon God, for confidence in him. "Who among you is a fearer of Jehovah, hearkening to the voice of his servant—who walketh in darkness and there is no light to him? Let him trust in the name of Jehovah, and lean upon his God," vs. 10. This was designed to support the faith of the disciples and other followers of Christ, who, believing in him, yet, from their imperfect knowledge, were perplexed and overwhelmed, for the moment, by the abuse he suffered at the bar of Caiaphas and Pilate, his condemnation, and his death. The person addressed is a fearer of Jehovah who hearkens to the voice of his servant, the Messiah, and yet walks in darkness at the period of his buffeting, scourging, and crucifixion, and sees no light; that is, is baffled and confounded by that termination of his mission, and while he lies in the sepulchre, knows not how to reconcile it with his Messiahship and the verification of the great predictions of the prophets, and of Christ himself, respecting his reign on the throne of David, and redemption of

their kindling a fire, and surrounding themselves with sparks, is put for inventing and embracing false views of the reason of Christ's rejection, condemnation, and death, and attempting to justify themselves in condemning and crucifying him as a false Messiah. The permission to walk in the light of the fire and sparks they were to kindle is a prophecy that they would be left to their delusions; and the prediction, "in pain ye shall lie down," is a prediction of the doom to endless destruction they were to meet from the risen Messiah, Judge, and Avenger, when he should summon them to his bar.

This chapter thus presents one of the most minute and graphic pictures in the Old Testament of the treatment the Messiah was to meet at his first advent—his rejection by the Israelites, his vindication of himself from their accusations; his subjection to mockery, buffeting, and scourging; his calmness, patience, and trust in God under those injuries; and the acknowledgment and justification he was to receive from Jehovah; with gracious counsels to his disciples in that dark hour, and forewarnings of judgment to his enemies.

Chapter LI. The preceding chapter closes with an intimation that the fearers of Jehovah who hearken to the voice of the Messiah were to walk in great darkness, and need strong faith in Jehovah and the direct support of his arm to sustain them; and a forewarning that those who followed the promptings of their own evil hearts, and relied on their own devices for safety, would be overwhelmed with misery. Those threatened evils, it is seen, from this chapter, were the desolation of their capital and country, and their dispersion, vassalage, and misery, for a long tract of ages, among the nations.

Jehovah, first to recall them from discouragement and despair to hope, reminds them of the covenant with Abraham, by which he had pledged himself to be the God of his seed for ever, vs. 1, 2. Next, he promises that he will restore Jerusalem from her ruin, and the land of the covenant from its desolation, vs. 3. He forewarns the nations who might regard him as having abandoned his covenant with Israel, that he will yet justify all his dealings with his revolting people, and fulfil all his promises to them, vs. 4–6.

He warns the obedient among the Israelites, not to heed the reproaches and threats of their enemies, vs. 7, 8. The prophet now appeals to Jehovah to interpose for their rescue, and foretells their exulting return at length from exile to their national land, vs. 9–11. God next expostulates with them for forgetting that he is their God and deliverer, vs. 12–16. He at last depicts the desolation and hopelessness to which the inhabitants of Jerusalem are to be reduced, vs. 17–20: and announces, that he will at length take the cup of sorrow and suffering from their lips, and cause it to be drunk by their enemies, vs. 21–23.

1. Apostrophe. "Hearken unto me, ye that seek after righteousness," vs. 1. They who seek after righteousness, are those doubtless who, in the close of the preceding chapter, are called fearers of Jehovah and hearkeners to the voice of his servant—"who walk in darkness and see no light." And they are to hearken to expostulations and promises, warnings and revelations, that were suited to cheer and sustain them in faith through the darkness and seeming hopelessness that were for ages to overshadow their nation.

2, 3. Hypocatastases. In the substitution of rock and

would be the God of that nation for ever, and they should be his people, and that he would give them the land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance. By Abraham's being called one—is meant his being called as an individual; that is, while yet without offspring.

4, 5. Comparisons. "For Jehovah has cheered Zion: he has cheered all her wastes; he has made her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found in her; thanksgiving and the voice of melody," vs. 3. This implies that Jerusalem was to become a ruin, and the land of Israel a waste and wilderness; and it predicts, not only that they shall be restored from the blight and desolation with which they were to be smitten; but that they shall be raised to a perfection and gorgeousness of beauty like that of the garden of Eden, as it was formed by the Creator; and as it is a literal prediction, it is to be literally fulfilled. There is no trope in it except the comparison: and in that figure, the names of the things compared are always used in their literal sense. That, therefore, which is to be cheered and made like Eden and the garden of God, is the ruin, the wilderness, and the desert of Zion. There is no room for an allegorical meaning. It is a violation of the law by which the language is used, to construe Zion, as,—instead of Zion,—the representative of the Gentile church.

6, 7. Apostrophes. "Attend unto me my people, Give ear to me my nation; for the law shall go forth from me; and I will cause my judgment to rest (remain settled) for a light to the Gentiles," vs. 4.

8. Metaphor in the use of light, for a means of instruction. This is a prediction of new revelations and institutes that were to be addressed to the Gentiles as well as the Israelites, and refers, doubtless, to the good news of salvation by Christ, and the appointments of the gospel dispensation. That the judgments were to rest for a light to the Gentiles, signifies that they were to be established over them permanently; they were to be an integral element in his sway over them.

9, 10. Metonymies in the use of arm, and arms of Jehovah for Jehovah himself. "My righteousness is near; my salvation is gone forth: and my arms shall judge the na-

tions; the isles shall wait for me; and in my arm shall they trust," vs. 5. Not only were the doctrines and appointments of the gospel to be communicated to the nations, and be essential elements of God's administration over them; but they were to be the means of salvation to Gentiles, as well as to Israelites. He was to judge them for their disobedience to his laws, as he had the Israelites; and under his gracious and holy sway the inhabitants of the isles were to look to him as their God, and trust in him for salvation.

11. Metonymy of isles for their inhabitants. By the isles were meant not only the islands of the Mediterranean, but the shores of that sea, and the whole of the distant west. This had its verification in the introduction of the gospel, and establishment of churches, in western Asia, northern Africa, and Europe, at the first promulgation of Christianity, and in the judgments God has inflicted on the nations inhabiting those regions, through a long series of ages for their apostasies.

The certainty of those great events, so contrary to the expectations of the Israelites, he now proceeds to confirm.

and by his righteousness, is meant the right he asserts and vindicates, as well as the righteousness he displays in the work of redemption by the Messiah. The prediction that the earth should grow old has had an impressive verification in the desolation with which Palestine, and all the countries with which it is surrounded, have for ages been swept — Syria, Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, Assyria, Asia Minor, and the cities of the Mediterranean. The prediction that the atmosphere is to be driven as smoke, is to meet its fulfilment at Christ's second coming. 2 Pet. iii. 10.

14. Apostrophe. — "Hearken unto me ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be afraid of their revilings," vs. 7. They that know righteousness, and in whose hearts is Jehovah's law, are those who, being renewed by the Spirit, become partakers of his salvation, through the Messiah, and desire and love the righteousness that marks that method of redemption. This command implies that they were to be regarded with dislike by men, and reproached and reviled because of their trust in Christ, and has reference, doubtless, to Gentile as well as Jewish believers. And this was verified in the aversion, hatred, and persecution with which the disciples of Christ, of both classes, began to be assailed in the first age, and were pursued in Asia, Africa, and Europe, for a long succession of centuries, and still are, not only throughout the domains of Mahommedanism, but also of the Greek and Roman churches. It has been equally verified, also, and is still, in reference to the pious Israelites, who, relying on these and other promises of this prophecy, look for the redemption of their nation from the curse of exile they are now suffering, and restoration to their own land. Their faith is regarded as a delusion, and mocked by multitudes even who bear the Christian name. They are not, however, to fear the reproaches of men, nor be disheartened by their revilings. God will verify his word.

15, 16. Comparisons.—"For the moth shall eat them like a garment; and the worm shall eat them like wool; but my righteousness shall be to eternity, and my salvation to the age of ages," vs. 8. This prediction has also been conspicuously fulfilled; all the great persecuting nations

who wasted the church in the first century, or during the ages that followed, have been swept to destruction like a garment that is devoured by moths: the Jews, the Syrians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Saracens, the Turks; and the Catholics and other persecutors that still survive, are at length to be consigned to destruction.

17, 18. Hypocatastases in the use of eating by the moth, and by the worm, for analogous modes of destruction.

19. Apostrophe. "Awake, awake; put on strength, arm of Jehovah. Awake as in the days of old, in the ages of eternities," vs. 9. This apostrophe is by the prophet, not by Jehovah.

20, 21, 22. Metaphors in the use of "awake," to denote rousing to vigorous action, and "put on strength," for visibly manifesting it—as insignia are put on by a monarch that denote his rank and authority.

23. Comparison of the powerful intervention of Jehovah now invoked, with that which had signalized the days of old, "the age of eternities." The days of old are doubtless the days of the deliverance from Egypt, of whose monarch and chief the sea-monster and the serpent are representatives.

24, 25. Hypocatastases in the substitution of sea-monster

27, 28. Metaphors in the use of overtake and flee. "Gladness and joy shall overtake them; sorrow and sighing shall flee away," vs. 11. Sorrow and sighing, which had been their associates during their long exile, are to fly from the Eden into which their land is to be converted at their restoration, as wholly unsuited to their nature; and gladness and joy, which had also been banished from Canaan during its desolation, are to set out on their return, on its new creation, overtake the Israelites, and be for ever thereafter their companions. This is a literal restoration. To attempt to allegorize it is not only to violate the language of the passage, but to convert it into confusion and nonsense. For, what can sorrow, and sighing, and their flight denote, if they are mere representatives of something else? What can joy and gladness signify, if they are mere representatives of something of a different nature? What can coming to Zion mean, if Zion, instead of being restored to its station and glory as the capital of the redeemed Hebrew kingdom, is, as the allegorists assume, to remain in its ruin and desecration, by the sway of false worshippers? If Zion, in its desolation and pollution, stands for the Christian church, does it not imply that that church, at the return to it of those whom Israel is supposed to represent, is to be in a moral desolation and pollution that answer to the material ruin of its representative?

29. Metaphor in the use of grass. "I, I am he that comforts you; who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of man who is to die; and of the son of man who shall become grass? And hast forgotten Jehovah thy maker stretching forth the heavens and founding the earth; and hast trembled continually all the day because of the wrath of the oppressor, as he made ready to destroy. And where is the wrath of the oppressor?" vs. 12, 13. This exhortation implies, that at the time of the return of the Israelites, they will be exposed to the rage of powerful enemies, and will forget, in their great fear, that Jehovah is their deliverer, and will infallibly fulfil his promises. Who the oppressors are to be, is indicated in the prediction, Zechariah xiv. 1–15, that after a partial return of the Israelites, the nations are to assail and endeavor to disperse them again, and are to be destroyed by the fires that are to be kindled by the ven-

geance of Jehovah. And this again shows that the restoration of the Israelites is to be literal. For if the event denoted by their return to Zion is the accession of the Gentiles to the Christian church, who are the parties who are to be their oppressors, and overwhelm them with fear and terror? Are the Jews, the only other class of human beings, to be in the supremacy and hold the whole Gentile world in subjection and vassalage?

"He—the oppressed—hastens bowing to be loosed: and he shall not die in the pit, and his bread shall not fail," vs. 14. This implies that the release of the captive Israelites will take place suddenly. They will scarce have time to assume the requisite attitude, ere their oppressors will strike the chains in which they are held from their limbs: and that change in the disposition of the despots who had striven to retain them in bondage, will be wrought, it is seen from the next verse, by the direct interposition of Jehovah.

30, 31. Hypocatastases. "And I am Jehovah thy God, rousing the sea and its waves roar, Jehovah of hosts is my

first formation, to be a formation again, or new creation of it; and this creation of new heavens and a new earth, is to take place, as foreshown chap. lxv. 17-25, at the return of the Israelites to their national land, restored from barrenness and desolation to fertility and beauty.

34. Metonymy of Zion, for its population.

35. Apostrophe. "Rouse thyself! Rouse thyself! Arise Jerusalem! thou who hast drunk at the hand of Jehovah the cup of his wrath; the dregs of the cup of trembling thou hast drunk, thou hast wrung them out," vs. 17.

36. Metonymy of Jerusalem for its inhabitants.

37, 38. Hypocatastases in the substitution of drinking a cup of wrath, and cup of trembling, for suffering the infliction of wrath and trembling in apprehension of it. This is a virtual prediction that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were to be smitten with the most terrible strokes of avenging justice, and to tremble with the fear of still further inflictions; and that at the period to which the prophecy refers, they are to be summoned to rouse themselves from lethargy and despair; as though deliverance were at hand. But there is to be no one among them at that crisis who can act as a successful leader.

39, 40. Hypocatastases. "There is no one to lead her, of all the sons she has brought forth, there is no one to grasp her by the hand, of all the sons she has brought up," vs. 18. Leading her and grasping her hand, are put for taking direction as a chief of the population of the city, and commanding and guiding them in the dangers and conflicts of that last crisis. They will be without such a head, and therefore in a degree in disorganization; the consequence not improbably of their returning from different quarters of the globe, speaking different languages, and inability thereby to select a common leader; and permitted by God, that they may feel the more deeply their dependence upon him.

41. Comparison. "These two things have befallen thee: who will mourn for thee? Wasting and ruin, famine and sword. Who but I will comfort thee? Thy sons are faint. They lie at the head of all the streets, like a wild bull in a net, filled with the wrath of Jehovah—the rebuke of thy God," vs. 23, 24. The two things that are to happen to the

people of Jerusalem are the wasting of their cities and land, and the destruction of themselves by famine and sword. That the sons lay at the head of all the streets, the points of combat, like a wild bull in a net, means that they are prostrate, helpless, and yet struggling in blind rage.

42. Metaphor, in the use of filled with wrath, to denote that they are suffering his wrath to the extent of their capacity. This is a prediction that the time immediately preceding their deliverance is to be one of great tribulation, as is foreshown in Daniel xii. i; and Zechariah xiv. i. They are to be overwhelmed, for a time, by the besieging Gentiles; many are to be slain, and many taken captive, and all hope from human resources extinguished.

43. Metaphor, in the use of drunken to denote the trembling and staggering that are to result from their faintness and fear. "Therefore, hear now this, thou afflicted and drunken, but not with wine. Thus saith the Lord, Jehovah, and thy God: he will defend his people," vs. 21, 22. Their deliverance is to come from him, not from their own courage or skill.

and helpless subjection to their imperious and cruel conquerors.

This prophecy thus contemplates the Israelites as under the discouragements of exile from their land, calls them to faith in the pledges of God's covenant with them, assures them of their final restoration in gladness and exultation, foretells the fearful humiliation and despair to which they are to be reduced immediately before their deliverance, and finally, announces that Jehovah himself will interpose for their redemption, and will, by a storm of avenging judgments, overwhelm and destroy their enemies.

Art. VI.—The Book of Judges.

BY THE REV. ENOCH POND, D.D.

When Canaan had been, in a great measure, subdued under Joshua, the land was divided by lot to the several tribes; the priests and Levites received their appointed cities, and the tabernacle worship was established in a central position at Shiloh. The people were then left with the injunction to complete the conquest of the country, to drive out or destroy the original inhabitants, to have no communication with them or their gods, but to adhere strictly to the worship of Jehovah. During the next three hundred years or more, they were chiefly under the direction of a class of men called, in our translation, Judges. The book of Judges is a concise history of this period.

In approaching this sacred book, let us first inquire as to its *authorship*, and the *time* when it was written. The probability is, that certain parts of the book were written by the scribes, in the time of the judges. We know that there were scribes, or genealogists, in all the tribes, whose business it was to keep an account of the respective families, and to register the more important events. As the book before us is of a somewhat fragmentary character, it is likely that some of the parts of which it is composed were originally written by these men. It must have been revised and com-

pleted, however, by some inspired man; and we know of no one to whom it may with so much probability be attributed as to Samuel. In several places the compiler throws in the remark, "In those days there was no king in Israel;" plainly implying that there *was* a king at the time when the revision was made, and yet it seems to have been entirely written before the time of David; for the Jebusites were still in possession of Jerusalem (see chap. i. 21); whereas it was among the first acts of David's reign to expel the Jebusites, and to take their stronghold for himself. (1 Chron. ii. 4.)

These facts indicate that the book must have been written, or completed during the reign of Saul; and who so likely to do it as Samuel? Samuel lived just at this time; he held the pen of a ready writer; he was an inspired man and a prophet, and the authorship of the book undoubtedly belongs to him. And it detracts nothing from its inspiration or Divine authority to suppose that, in some of its parts, it is a compilation; for, the different parts entering into it being before the writer, the Spirit of God could direct him just what to take and what to omit and what

be such, and promised obedience. He had given them a full code of political laws and institutions, and some one was needed to administer the government under him, or at least to superintend its administration. This work devolved upon Moses and Joshua as long as they lived; and when they were removed it descended to others.

Between Joshua and Saul there were fifteen of these judges, viz.: Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah, Gideon, Abimelech, Tolah, Jair, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, Samson, Eli, and Samuel. Some of these were appointed directly and supernaturally by God himself; others were called to office by the force of circumstances, or by the people, with the manifest approbation of God. Abimelech alone may be regarded as an usurper, and we have hesitated about naming him among the judges of Israel. Eli was high priest as well as judge.

The judges were called forth ordinarily, to meet some special occasion or exigency, and had a general direction of affairs, both in peace and war. Their work was always laborious, and sometimes difficult, and hazardous in the extreme. There was no salary attached to their office, and no income appropriated to them, unless it was a larger share, in some instances, in the spoils of war, and presents occasionally made to them in token of personal regard They were simple in their manners, moderate in their desires, and generally free from avarice or ambition. They continued in office during life, but had no authority to appoint successors. They were in general a noble class of men, who felt that whatever they might do for the Israelitish nation was above all reward; who chose rather to deserve well of their country than to be enriched from its resources.

If it be inquired here, What was the state of Israel under the judges? We answer, that it was, in general, one of *prosperity and peace.* This remark may excite surprise, but it is nevertheless true. Thus after Othniel, it is said that the land had rest forty years; after Ehud, eighty years; after Deborah and Barak, forty years; in the days of Gideon, forty years, and so on. To be sure, there were in these times, occasional and sometimes terrible outbreakings of wickedness, followed, of course, with distressing judgments,

but these were confined, for the most part, to particular tribes, or sections of the country. There was a good deal of idolatry among the people. This seems to have been their constantly besetting sin. Still the tabernacle of God was open at Shiloh, and his altars were reverenced. There were magistrates and courts of justice in every city. On the whole, it is not likely that in any other equal period the children of Israel enjoyed so much of quietude, liberty, and prosperity, as they did under the judges. And this shows how unreasonable they were in wishing to terminate this form of government, and to have a king.

It may be well to inquire, in this connexion, how long the rule of the judges continued. It will be said, perhaps, that the apostle Paul has decided this question for us. In a speech in one of the Jewish synagogues he says: "And after that,"—the conquest and division of Canaan,—"he gave unto them judges, about the space of *four hundred and fifty years*, until Samuel the prophet." (Acts xiii. 20) But this chronology can never be made to harmonize with that of the Old Testament. In 1 Kings vi. 1, it is said, that

case, and the probability is that they often run into each other. Assuming the correctness of the statement in 1 Kings iv. 1, that Solomon commenced building the temple in the 480th year after the exode of the Israelites from Egypt, it will not be difficult to decide as to the period of the Judges. The Israelites were forty years in the wilderness; and the conquest and settlement of Canaan may have occupied seven years more. Here, then, are forty-seven years to be taken from the 480. Allowing forty years to the administration of Saul (see Acts xiii. 21), and forty more to the reign of David (see 1 Kings ii. 11), and supposing Solomon to have commenced building the temple in the fourth year of his reign, here will be eighty-four more years—amounting, in all, to 131—to be taken from the 480. And 480—131, leaves 349 years to be given to the Judges; or to be reckoned between the settlement in Canaan and the commencement of the reign of Saul.

There is another reason why this shorter period for the rule of the Judges is to be preferred. We find only four generations between Salmon, who married Rahab, the hostess of Jericho, soon after the settlement in Canaan, and David. Salmon and Rahab were the parents of Boaz, and Boaz and Ruth were the parents of Obed; Obed was the father of Jesse, and Jesse of David (Ruth iv. 21, 22). Now we must stretch these four generations to the utmost limit of probability to make them last 349 years; or rather, 359. For Saul had reigned some ten years when David was born. They cannot possibly be extended another hundred years.

We proceed now to a brief analysis of the contents of the book before us. This book properly consists of two parts. The first sixteen chapters are a continuous history. The four last chapters—containing the story of Micah and the Danites; also of the Levite and his concubine, and the consequent war upon the Benjamites—belong to an earlier part of the history, and were thrown in at the end, so as not to interrupt the narrative. They constitute what we may call an appendix to the book. The book of Ruth may be regarded as a second appendix; since the events there so beautifully narrated took place in the time of the Judges.

The history commences with a vigorous attempt on the part of *some of the tribes*—particularly those of Judah,

Simeon, Benjamin, and Ephraim—to subdue the remainder of the Canaanites. They failed, however, to destroy them utterly, but satisfied themselves with putting them under tribute. After this they began to associate with them, and to contract family alliances; and then it was no longer possible to destroy them without destroying their own kindred.

In consequence of being thus mixed up with the Canaanites, the Israelites would naturally be invited to their festivals, and be led to participate in the worship of their gods. Thus they were led into idolatry, with all its kindred abominations; and this brought upon them distressing judgments from the hand of their covenant God and King.

The first oppressor of the Israelites was Chushan-rishathaim, who is styled the King of Mesopotamia. He invaded the territories of Israel from the East, and imposed a tribute upon them which lasted eight years. At the end of this period the people were humbled, and cried unto the Lord for help. He heard their cry, and raised up Othniel, a nephew and son-in-law of Caleb, to be their deliverer. The

After the death of Othniel, the Israelites revolted still farther from God, and to chastise them, he suffered Eglon, King of Moab, assisted by the Ammonites and Amalekites, to bring them into bondage eighteen years. This hard service brought them again to repentance. They cried unto the Lord for help, and he raised them up a deliverer from the diminished tribe of Benjamin. This man's name was Ehud; who, being employed to carry the annual tribute to the king of Moab, slew him with a concealed weapon; and then, gathering the Israelites together, fell upon the bands of Moab and destroyed them. After this the land had rest for the long period of eighty years.

These first invasions of Israel were, both of them, from the East. The next was from the Philistines, who dwelt upon the sea-coast, in the south-western part of Canaan. How long they continued their depredations we are not informed; but, in his own good time, God raised up a mighty man for the deliverance of his people. This was Shamgar, the son of Anath; who—strengthened, like Samson, by a supernatural power—slew six hundred Philistines with an ox-goad.

Meanwhile, idolatry was spreading in the northern part of the country, under the influence of the Danites; and to chastise his revolted people, God let loose upon them Jabin, who is styled King of Canaan, and who reigned at Hazor. This man had a powerful army, and nine hundred armed chariots, all under the direction of Sisera, one of the most experienced captains of the age. The Israelites were so oppressed by him that they durst not travel the common road, or cultivate their fields, or dwell in villages; but were obliged to retire into the mountain fastnesses and other fortified places. In their distress, they cried again unto the Lord, and he sent them relief by the hands of Deborah and Barak. Instigated by Deborah, Barak drew together an army at Mount Tabor. Sisera marched his forces, with all possible speed, to attack him. While his army lay encamped at the foot of the mountain, Barak came down upon him with such fury that he could make no resistance, but fled in the utmost consternation. At the same time God poured upon the enemies of his people a driving storm of rain and hail, which swelled the rivers to such an extent, that in attempt-

ing to ford them, great numbers of the Canaanites were swept away. The rout was complete; the victory was gained; and to celebrate it, Deborah composed the beautiful song recorded in Judges, chap. v. After this the land had rest forty years.

It was during this period that the country was visited with drought and famine, and many of the people were constrained to migrate into other lands to obtain a subsistence. This was true, in particular, of Elimelech and Naomi; and here comes in, properly, the story of Ruth.

After the death of Deborah and Barak the Israelites fell into their old impieties, and were again delivered into the hand of their enemies. Their oppressors, in this instance, were the Midianites, who dwelt on their south-eastern border. These predatory hordes, assisted, no doubt, by the Amalekites and Moabites, came up in vast numbers, robbed Israel of their cattle, and carried away all the fruits of the earth. They left little or nothing behind them. In their distress, the Israelites cried unto the Lord, and he sent a prophet to instruct and reprove them. He also sent an

devoured the men of Shechem; and a fire came forth from the men of Shechem, and destroyed Abimelech."

After the death of Abimelech, Tola, the son of Puah, an eminent man of the tribe of Issachar, was called to the government, and continued in it for twenty-three years. He seems to have been a prudent and peaceable man, raised up to reform abuses, to suppress tumults, and heal the wounds which had been inflicted upon church and state during Abimelech's usurpation. Very little is recorded of him in the Scriptures.

After him arose Jair, a Gileadite, of the tribe of Manasseh—the first of the judges whose home was on the east side of the Jordan. We know little of him, except that he was intent upon aggrandizing his own family; for we are told that he had "thirty sons, who rode on thirty ass colts, and who had thirty cities in the land of Gilead." His administration continued twenty-two years, in which time there was a general defection from the worship of the true God into the idolatries of the surrounding nations. "The children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim, and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, and of Zidon, and of Moab, and of the Philistines, and of the children of Ammon." This was the most general and alarming defection which had occurred since the settlement in Canaan; and, as usual, it prepared the way for distressing judgments. The Ammonites were let loose upon the Israelites on the east, and the Philistines on the south and west, and the people were distressed and enslaved eighteen years. In this time they had abundant opportunity for reflection, and to see the error of their ways. They mourned over their sins; they acknowledged the justice of God in their inflictions; they put away the strange gods that were among them, and turned unto the Lord their God; and his soul, we are told, "was grieved for the misery of Israel," and he interposed again on their behalf. The deliverer, in this instance, was Jephthah, the Gileadite. He first engaged the Ammonites, on the east side of the Jordan, and smote them with a very great slaughter. His success in this enterprise provoked the envy of the Ephraimites, who crossed the Jordan to attack him. But their envy and hatred injured only themselves. Jephthah encountered them, and there fell of the

children of Ephraim, in one day, forty-two thousand men. After this, Jephthah lived in peace and honor, and judged Israel six years.

He was succeeded by Ibzan of Bethlehem, who judged Israel seven years. After him was Elon, of the tribe of Zebulon, who ruled ten years. Following him was Abdon, of the tribe of Ephraim, who continued in office eight years. Of these several judges, the Sacred History says very little. In their times the Israelites seem to have had rest and peace; the result of which was a falling away from God. They relapsed into their old idolatries, and God delivered them into the hands of the Philistines, who oppressed them forty years.

Towards the close of this period Samson made his appearance—one of the most singular characters of which we have any account in the Bible. We should hardly know that he was a pious man, but that Paul mentions him among the worthies who, through faith, "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, and put to flight the armies of the aliens." (Heb. xi. 32.)

Samson was a Nazarite, consecrated to be such by his parents before his birth. The vow of a Nazarite bound him to abstain entirely from wine and strong drink, and to wear his hair and his beard unshorn. On the fulfilment of this vow, Samson was to be endowed with supernatural strength, and thus be qualified to be the deliverer of his people. While his strength continued, he had various strange encounters with the Philistines, in all of which he came off victorious. In one instance, he slew a thousand of them with no other weapon than the jaw-bone of an ass. His besetting sin seems to have been the love of women; and this, at length, proved his ruin. He became enamored of a vile, mercenary woman (probably a Philistine), whose name was Delilah. After several attempts, she drew from him the secret of his prodigious strength. The endowment was conditioned on the fulfilment of his Nazarite vow, in the wearing of his hair. Having discovered this, Delilah cut off his hair, while sleeping with his head upon her

knees. And now he fell an easy prey into the hands of the Philistines. They fell upon him, bound him, put out his eyes, and put him in prison, where he was obliged to turn a hand-mill, like the meanest slave.

But, in a little time, Samson's hair began to grow, and with it his strength gradually returned; so that when the Philistines brought him out to make themselves merry over him, and thousands of them covered and filled the house before which he was standing, he contrived to get hold of the two pillars by which the house was mainly supported, and when he had prayed, he bowed himself with all his might, and the pillars were shaken, the house fell, and he was killed, together with thousands of his enemies. He slew more in his death than he had done in his life.

Although Samson is numbered among the Judges of Israel, he seems never to have had the administration of affairs in his hands. These were entrusted to Eli, the high priest, who was born before Samson, and who lived long after his death. Eli became a judge in Israel at the age of fifty-eight, and his administration continued during the next forty years. He died at the age of ninety-eight. (See 1. Sam. iv. 15–18.)

Though repeatedly beaten and humbled by the forays of Samson, the Philistines were not vanquished. They continued their depredations, and kept the Israelites in perpetual fear. Near the close of Eli's life, the children of Israel gathered courage, and went out to Aphek to fight with the Philistines; but they were beaten before them, and four thousand of their number were left dead upon the field. Hoping to retrieve their loss in another encounter, the Israelites sent to Shiloh, took the ark of the covenant from between the cherubim, and carried it into their camp. But though the ark and the priests were with them, the God of Israel was not. The Israelites were again discomfited, and forty thousand of their footmen fell. Nor was this all. The ark of God was taken, and the two sons of Eli who accompanied it were slain. When tidings of this dreadful defeat, and of the capture of the ark, came to the ears of the venerable Eli, he fainted, fell from his seat, and died. He was a good man, and zealous for the honor and worship of the true God; but he failed essentially in the training

and government of his family. "His sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not."

But God was now raising up for himself a Judge and Prophet, more eminent than any who had lived since the days of Joshua. This was *Samuel;* of whom, as his history does not fall within the book of Judges, we shall not now speak. Meanwhile, there are some questions, growing out of the transactions which have been related, which require consideration.

The first of these relates to the conduct of Ehud, and of Jael, in the murders of Eglon and of Sisera. Eglon was a king of Moab, to whom the Israelites were under tribute. Ehud was sent to carry to him the tribute money. When his mission was accomplished, and he had commenced his journey homeward, suddenly, he dismisses his attendants, returns to Eglon, and, under pretence of a secret errand, gains access to him in private. He now says: "I have a message from God unto thee, O king;" and when the king rose to receive it, he plunged a dagger to his heart and escaped. Such is a brief statement of the case of Ehud.

writers, that they make no effort to conceal their wrong doings. Ehud and Jael may both of them have done wrong; and yet both may have been, on the whole, pious persons. There is nothing in Scripture which looks like an approval of the deed of Ehud; and as to the praises which Deborah bestowed upon Jael, these may have been the spontaneous outburst of her own grateful and patriotic feelings,* and not a direct revelation from God.

This is our way of getting over the difficulties above presented; and the *only* one, as it seems to us, except upon a single supposition; which is, that these avengers of the wrongs of Israel both acted under a *Divine impulse*, which amounted to a special revelation, a commission from the Most High. This is possible, and in our judgment not improbable; and if so, we have a full justification, in both instances, of their conduct. God had a right to cut off those cruel oppressors of his people in any way that he pleased,—by disease, by famine, by a stroke of lightning, or by the sword of their enemies. He had a right to commission Ehud to go and kill Eglon, as he commissioned Joshua to destroy the Canaanites; and there are some things in the narrative which go to confirm this view of the case. "I have a message *from God* unto thee, O king." Now who shall say that, in this instance, Ehud did not tell the truth? And so in the case of Jael. The skill, the adroitness, the heroism she displayed, as well as the praises which were bestowed upon her afterwards (supposing the praises to have been from God) all go to show that she acted under a Divine impulse, which amounted to a special revelation.

Another question of some difficulty grows out of the case of Jephthah and his daughter. When Jephthah went forth against the Ammonites, he made a vow unto the Lord, that if he was enabled to triumph over them, and was returned to his house in peace, whatsoever should first come forth from his doors to meet him, should be the Lord's, and he would offer it up for a burnt offering. So when he returned, the first one to come forth to greet him was his daughter, his only child; and it is said that he did to her according to his vow. The question now is, Did he offer her up for a

* Recorded, of course, under a Divine inspiration.

burnt sacrifice? and could he be justified in so doing? Our opinion is, that he did not make a sacrifice of her, and for the following reasons:—1. The language of Jephthah's vow, interpreted as it well may be, does not imply so much as this. The little Hebrew letter *vau*, commonly translated *and*, is in some instances translated *or*, and may be so translated here. And thus rendered, the vow would read: "Whatsoever cometh forth first to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, *or* I will offer it up for a burnt offering." The meaning is, If the creature first coming forth is suitable for a burnt offering, it shall be offered up, but if not, it shall be perpetually consecrated and devoted to the Lord. Now his daughter was not suitable for a burnt offering. He could not so dispose of her, in consistency with the law of Moses, or with the spirit of his religion. What then does his vow bind him to do? To consecrate and devote her to the Lord, to be in a peculiar sense *his*, so that she shall never be given in marriage to any man. She must belong to the Lord, and to no one else. This seems to us to be the pur-

gression and sin, though he will by no means clear the guilty."

3. We learn the *faithfulness* of God, in the afflictions which he sends upon his erring people. He inflicts the rod because they need it. He will not suffer them to wander away from him and perish.

4. We see God's readiness to *forgive* and *restore* his wandering people, so soon as they repent and return. Time after time, when his people were humbled, and began to call upon him in truth, his ear was open to their request, and a deliverance was provided.

Finally: If God's people would not feel the rod, they must cease to deserve it. Let them live near to him at all times, and walk faithfully in his truth, and they may enjoy the perpetual sunshine of his love. "Their peace shall be as a river, and their righteousness as the waves of the sea."

Art. VII.—Mr. Hequembourg's Plan of Creation.

Plan of Creation; or Other Worlds, and Who Inhabit Them. By Rev. C. L. Hequembourg. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1859.

The frequent appearance of works, the aim of which is—under the pretext of correcting great and mischievous religious errors that prevail—to set aside essential truths of revelation, and substitute some scheme of philosophy or science, falsely so called, in their place; and the ready reception they meet, bespeak the existence of a large body in the community who are either prepossessed against the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures, or else are not sufficiently familiar with them to detect at once the bearing of theories that are founded on the rejection of their authority, and designed to misrepresent and supplant their teachings. These volumes are put forth by ministers of the church. They wear the garb of religion. They are commended by the press, and are circulated in a measure by active partisans; and if left unchecked, are likely to

draw many to the adoption of their errors. This renders it the duty of the friends of truth to expose their false views, and caution the unwary against their deceptive professions. We have performed this office, of late, in regard to a number of volumes, as those of Hickok, Lewis, Donaldson, Davidson, Hudson, Bushnell, and Lee. Mr. Hequembourg's work belongs to the same rationalistic, anti-scriptural class, though peculiar in some of its views. The main elements of his theory are, that all other worlds were created at the same time as ours; that man is the only rational creature—though Mr. H., in some passages, recognises angels as of a different order; that all moral creatures necessarily fall into sin; that sin is necessary to all individuals, in order to the possibility of their becoming established in holiness, and is in that relation a good, and not an evil; that the object of Christ's incarnation was to display his love, and exhibit to mankind a model man; that the sin of man now lies in rejecting salvation, not in the violation of laws, which, irrespective of that, make salvation necessary; that salvation through Christ is offered to vast crowds in the world

any other that he pleases. He finds no difficulty, accordingly, in getting rid of the most specific confutations of his theory. The magic touch of his wand empties them of their grammatical meaning, and turns them into any shape, and invests them with any signification that renders them subservient to his ends. The fabric he has erected has therefore no solid foundation nor cohesion; any one of its elements may be easily stricken away, and the whole structure overthrown. We do not propose to follow him step by step through his loosely connected argument, but only to show that some of the important points he attempts to maintain he has not established, and cannot; that others not only are not proved, but are radically and wholly false; and finally, that others still are not only false, but subversive of the most essential doctrines of revelation.

I. He first maintains that the whole of the material worlds that make up the universe were called into existence at the same time as our earth.

"The Scriptures do not admit of any great comparative antiquity of any part of the universe. They represent the creation as produced at the same general period. A priority, or pre-eminence of *some kind*, is given to the earth in the creation.

"It cannot be doubted that the account of the creation which we have in Genesis embraces the entire system of nature. 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.' The expression, 'in the beginning,' is in itself sufficiently indefinite to admit of its including very wide and numerous intervals of time. But the expression denotes a *commencement*. The heavens and the earth are included in the same idea; when they were made, the whole creation rose into being together. The statement, however, may relate in an exclusive manner to what may be called the rudimental productions of nature." —Pp. 46, 47.

This is a specimen of the manner in which Mr. Hequembourg deduces conclusions that have no ground in the terms or facts from which he draws them. The phrase, "the heaven and earth," taken in the most comprehensive sense that can with any show of propriety be ascribed to them, can only denote the earth and that body of celestial

worlds that were, through the eye, known to the Hebrews of the Mosaic age; and that is the nebula or cloud of worlds of which our earth and solar system are a part. No other orbs can be seen by the unassisted eye, and no others were known to the Hebrews, or any other nation, till towards the close of the last century. As, then, the term "the heaven and the earth" never had with the Hebrews any larger meaning than that, it is against that clear and indubitable limitation of their sense to interpret them as including the countless clouds of worlds disconnected with that to which our sphere belongs, which the modern telescope has revealed. Those clouds are no more comprised in the heavens and earth of the narrative of the creation in Genesis, than they were in the faith of those to whom that narrative was communicated. They sustain no physical relations to our nebula, so far as we know, but are as completely isolated from it as though ours did not exist.

It is not by any means certain, indeed, that the heaven and the earth of Genesis comprised any orbs beyond those of our solar system, nor is it probable. The phrase "in the

II. He next maintains that man is the only rational being that peoples the worlds.

"We have no knowledge that any other worlds are inhabited by any other rational beings beside man. The improbability of a different supposition has been conclusively shown in the former part of this work. The universe is in its infancy, and man is the only being hitherto created capable of occupying the realms of nature. Nor did the first generations of good men receive their new bodily endowments, fitting them for the material worlds of space, until the establishment of the Christian dispensation, and the advancement of the race far enough to render secure the commencement of the great plan. When Christ came, therefore, the second time, in the concluding period of the first century of the Christian era, the populating of other worlds began. This is the great epoch in the universe, and with it the great era of the world and creation concur."—Pp. 384, 385.

He here seems to deny that there are any other intelligences in the universe than men. In a former chapter, however, he admits that there are angels.

"We have already taken two steps; we have shown that *we are entirely destitute of astronomical evidence that the material universe contains an inhabitant besides man;* and we have now shown that *the world occupies in the order of time the first place in the creation;* and probably it has, in some other sense, a central position. But the Scriptures will further elucidate this interesting subject. They may be immediately seen to shed great light upon it, in two familiar statements: that the *office* of angels *is the care of the* [this] *world:* and these higher intelligences are interested in a peculiar manner in the mission of Christ to the world, and are agents in carrying forward its designs."—Pp. 57, 58.

He wholly fails, however, to show that there are no angels except those that are employed in missions to this world, or that beside angels there are no other intelligent creatures but of our race. The passage he quotes to prove that there are no angels but those who minister to mankind, has reference only to such as fill the office of messengers to this world; it does not affirm or imply that there are not other individuals and orders of angels. The design of the apostle in the passage, Heb. i., is to demonstrate the superiority of

the Son of God, the Messiah, to angels. "When he had purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made as much better than [superior to] the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For to which of the angels said he at any time: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" (exalted thee to that relation.) "And to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth on a ministry on account of those who are to inherit salvation?" The angels here spoken of are plainly those who have a mission to this world; and the object of the declaration is, simply to show that no one of them has any higher office than that of a ministry on behalf of the heirs of salvation. No one of them is exalted to the rank of son; no one of them sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high, invested with divine authority over the earth and other worlds. The expression has reference, therefore, only to the angels who fill the office of messengers to this world. It has no relation to those orders or individuals who have

and invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all were created by him and for him." And Eph. iii. 10, where principalities and powers are expressly designated as of the heavenly orbs: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly (worlds) might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." There are, then, orders of intelligences in the heavenly worlds who are invested with a sway as rulers over other intelligent beings, and are yet expressly distinguished from the angels who fill the office of ministers—not rulers—toward men on the earth. The scene in which they act is wholly different, and the office which they fill altogether unlike and superior. They have authority, they reign on thrones, they rule. They must, therefore, reveal themselves to those who are under their sway; make communications to them, directly, of the laws which they are commissioned to unfold and execute; and receive direct and visible expressions of submission to their authority from their subjects. Otherwise, their powers and agencies would have no correspondence to their titles. And that the subjects of these sceptred powers are of a different order from themselves is not only possible and probable, but is clearly implied in other passages, as Psalm ciii. 18–22: "Bless Jehovah, ye his angels that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word. Bless ye Jehovah, all his hosts, ye ministers of his that do his pleasure. Bless Jehovah, all his works, in all places of his dominion." Here the angels that excel in strength are distinguished from the hosts of intelligences who are ministers of his, by which they are defined as filling offices of service toward other ranks of intelligences. Mere unintelligent things do not stand in need of the ministry of angels. This latter class of subjects are accordingly comprised in the more comprehensive terms, "all his works in all places of his dominion," in which the term works plainly denotes intelligences; first, because they are distinguished from the places or parts of the material universe in which they reside; and next, because they are summoned to bless Jehovah, which is a mental and religious act, that is never ascribed in the Scriptures to an unintelligent existence. It is the act of holy ones. "All thy works

praise thee, O Jehovah, and thy saints shall bless thee." There are intelligences, then, in the several parts of God's vast empire, that are neither angels of the highest order, nor of the rank whose office it is to minister to inferior orders of rational beings; but who are themselves, doubtless, of those inferior ranks, and fitted by their physical nature for the material realms which are their dwelling-places. Mr. Hequembourg, accordingly; not only does not prove his propositions that there are no angels but those who minister in our world, and no other order of rational beings but men, but they are in open contradiction to the clear teachings of the word of God.

III. He holds that the fall of angels and men—that is, according to his theory, all moral beings—sprang, necessarily, from their nature and condition, and could not have been prevented by the Most High.

"In solving the problem respecting the origin of moral evil, it is impossible, at the present stage of the inquiry, to discuss the question whether the fall of Adam might have been prevented or delayed. His fall may have been precipitated or not. But we have already seen that moral evil had an existence in the very nature of his case, as an inexperienced being. Had he remained innocent, therefore, it is impossible that he should have attained at once to a high state of virtue, or have immediately escaped the hazards of temptation; he would have been still in the state of imperfection. We have seen, therefore, the origin of moral evil as a matter of fact. The subject of its *treatment* may be reserved for distinct consideration. In what degree it should be suffered to exist—*since exist it must, if moral beings were created at all*—was a question to be solved by the divine mind, and must be studied by contemplating the facts in the case." —Pp. 120, 121.

He thus maintains, expressly, that all moral creatures not only do, and will, but must necessarily fall; and attempts to sustain that revolting doctrine by two pretexts. 1st. That God cannot communicate to a new created mind such views of himself and his will as to sway it to obedience; and 2d. That he has no method of communicating to a moral being that knowledge which is necessary to lead him to obedience, except through the experience of sin. Thus he says:

"The difficulty of instructing and of governing beings who were, at the same time, commencing an existence of their own, and breaking the ways of a new and responsible moral existence in the creation, must have been very great, and will appear to be so upon every consideration of the variety and force of human passions. As the effort to govern such beings must have been attended also with consequences of vast moment, we may be sure that the wisest course was adopted for this purpose.

"We may conceive, in such a case, of the application of measures which would apply to no other condition of moral beings. Such moral beings could have had no moral ideas of their own; and when there were *none to impart*, in a universe barren of them, or limited in its experience, it was obviously necessary to produce them: in short, it was necessary to *create* an experience suited to become the basis of a system of moral instruction, and it was proper to effect this end by means adapted to a case so peculiar."—P. 120.

"It must appear evident God did all, in his personal manifestation, but convey the conceptions of his own mind directly to man. But this was not done; nor could it be done in any other manner than that which has been and is employed to effect a progressive advancement of mankind. It seems almost needless to observe that ideas are the product of the human understanding acting upon what is presented to it. *They cannot be communicated to it directly;* and where any culture has existed, they must be communicated to it, so to speak, through the avenues which have been previously prepared. . . . God has always addressed the world through the medium of their passions and their experience. The conceptions of the divine mind could not have been imparted in full to an undeveloped human understanding; nor could they have been fully communicated without rendering man divine. We have reason to suppose, therefore, that *all which it was possible to communicate, was done.*"—P. 123.

He thus denies on the one hand, that moral beings, just commencing their existence, could have or receive any moral ideas, and on the other, that God could impart them to them; and he holds that that inability to acquire or receive such ideas, lies in their inexperience, and that the only way in which they can become capable of a knowledge of good is by a fall and experience of evil.

"We have seen, by a historical and matter of fact view of

the case, by a method in short, in which all philosophy is founded, evil had its actual birth in the weakness of a creature which was to learn and to derive its *wisdom* from experience."—P. 364.

"We have seen that if the fall had not occurred, or if man had not lost his innocence in the way he did, *an imperfect moral condition would necessarily have existed* . . . Our natural depravity, and the Adamic history, may now both be called an experience of great value. The mystery of the fall, considering it as a part of the divine plan, vanishes in this way of viewing it, and becomes an event, regarding it as belonging to the providence of God, benevolent and beneficial in its character."—P. 159.

But this denial of the possibility that moral beings, in the early part of their existence, should acquire or receive moral ideas, is false, and subversive of God's rights and their responsibility. To deny that they are then capable of moral ideas is to deny that they are capable of such a knowledge of God and their relations to him as would excite in them a sense of his rights and their responsibility. But to maintain that at the commencement of their existence, they are

their affections toward him into action, is equally false and absurd; as it is to deny either that he could have access to their minds, or else that he has the requisite power and skill to communicate the knowledge of himself to them, through the medium of the senses, or the influence of his Spirit. But to deny either, is to deny the fact and possibility of his exercising a government over them. If he could not make himself known to them, he plainly could not institute a law over them, nor hold them responsible for not recognising him and doing his will. Their nature would place them as absolutely out of the sphere of a moral government, as though they were mere brutes. But God, in place of being debarred from the minds of such beings, or obstructed in his power over them, has as full access to them in the dawn of their existence as at any later period, and as absolute power to determine their thoughts, and impart to them any measure of knowledge he pleases. He can reveal himself to them visibly, if he chooses, as he did to our first parents, and communicate knowledge to them by his voice. He can send his messengers to them, and make known his will through their ministry. Or he can directly inspire them, by his Spirit, with any degree of intelligence on any subject that he chooses. It is one of the grandest and most wonderful features of our nature that we are thus susceptive of illumination by that omniscient Agent, and may be put in an instant in possession of truth, in its loftiest and most resplendent forms, on any subject that respects him, his will, his kingdom, or ourselves and fellow-creatures.

The notion that new created moral beings could acquire such ideas and realizations of God's being, perfections, rights, and will, and their responsibility to him, as are essential to their acting as accountable agents, only by falling into sin and experiencing its evil, is equally false and revolting. Mr. Hequembourg proceeds, in his speculations on this branch of his subject, on the assumption that such beings, though created, like Adam and Eve, with minds and bodies that were perfect and mature in their powers, must yet be as incapable of at once using their mental faculties and corporeal organs and powers, as infants are, and like them, pass through a process of training and use ere their faculties

could be developed and rise to the quickness, ease, and strength of mature life. But that is mistaken and preposterous. Adam and Eve were not created in the helplessness and incompetence of infancy. They were not obliged to go through a long course of experiment and training ere they could use their limbs, walk, gather fruit for their sustenance, communicate with each other by speech, and offer homage to God. They were able, the first moment of their being, to use their powers of body and mind with as entire ease and effect, as at any subsequent stage of their existence; and were as competent, therefore, at once, to receive a full knowledge of their Maker, benefactor, and ruler, and cherish all the forms of holy affection toward him, as other beings are in the maturity of their powers.

But had it been otherwise, the supposition that they could only acquire such ideas of God and their duty as were requisite to their acting with responsibility, by sinning and experiencing the evil of sin, is revolting in the extreme. It implies that no truths which God could convey to them respecting his being, character, relations, and will, could

and guiding influences, and abandonment of them to the sway of their darkened and perverted minds. The next effect was, the unobstructed access and sway over them of that subtle and malignant being—the great fallen angel—who had drawn them by his arts into sin; and the third was the emergence into supremacy of selfish and malign affections, a sense of guilt, fear, dread, a wish to escape the presence of God, and a disposition to palliate their sin by the temptation by which they were excited to it. But these effects had no tendency to lead them to juster views and realizations of God's excellence and title to their love and submission. So far from it, the result was the total alienation of their fallen minds from him, and settled vassalage to the sway of evil.

The effect of sinning, accordingly, unless counteracted by the Spirit of God, is universally to blind it to the loveliness of the divine character, blunt its sensibility to the evil of sin, strengthen its selfish and malevolent affections, and fix it in impenitence and alienation. It is never roused to a perception and consciousness of its guilt by the mere thoughts of its sins that rise spontaneously from its experience of its evil. If startled from its insensibility, led into the light of truth, and awakened to remorse for its transgressions, it is the work of the Spirit of God resisting and overcoming, by his almighty power, its natural tendencies. Were Mr. Hequembourg's theory true, the reverse would be the fact. The more marked the forms in which beings rebel, the higher the energy to which their hostile and malign passions rise, the more heaven-daring and impious the shapes their rebellion assumes,—the more truthful, the ampler, and the more energetic their ideas of right must become, the more intense their sense of the justice of God's claims to their love, the profounder their feeling of the guilt of their sins, and the greater their disposition to turn to obedience. And Satan, accordingly, and his associates in revolt, who have the highest rank in intelligence, have sinned in the most audacious and reprehensible form, and continued the longest in rebellion, must have made nearer approaches than any others to a just estimate of their sins, and be the most hopeful candidates for a return to obedience! The proper method, thence, of recovering fallen beings from

the dominion of sin, is to plunge them, or leave them to plunge themselves deeper and deeper into its abysses. The lower they sink, the higher they ascend! The farther they depart from God, the nearer they approach him! On that principle parents also, to preserve their children from vice and lead them to virtue, should incite them to evil in place of good; teachers should instruct those with whose education they are entrusted, in error instead of truth, in wickedness instead of righteousness; rulers should encourage and reward crimes, instead of punishing them, and discourage virtue, and disgrace and obstruct it with prohibitions and penalties! It is a little unfortunate for Mr. Hequembourg's scheme for reforming the world, that it is identically that which Satan, after a long and large experience, pursues to render men his hopeless vassals and accomplish their eternal destruction. Moreover, if true, it may have a far wider application than to beings who have just commenced existence. If sinning is indispensable to the moral culture of beings in that stage of their existence and preparation for holiness, how can Mr. Hequembourg prove that it will not

remain, therefore, to show that the treatment of moral evil itself has been wise, and that the fall of Adam has not been a calamity to the world—taking the widest conception of the entire race in all their preparatory state."—Pp. 125, 126.

"It will be admitted that the derivation of a fallen posterity from Adam was entirely a divine arrangement. That evil of the apostasy might have been stopped where it began, had it pleased God thus to have arrested it. *Here, then, is the positive* INSTITUTION *of evil in the world by the divine purpose*—a fact, however, which we must carefully distinguish from the unavoidable nature of a moral creation in which it had its origin. Here is the first step in the real and great plan by which the creation is ultimately to rejoice in the wisdom of God. The Creator designed that the great race of beings who are to pass away, in illimitable generations, from this world to others, should commence in evil, and learn obedience through sufferings." —P. 370.

"There has been, however, an obstacle interposed to a full perception of the bearings of this doctrine, by the limited views entertained respecting the destiny and place in the creation belonging to the human race. When it has been shown that man is the principal creature in the universe, demanding the care of God; that the stupendous system of redemption was designed for him alone—God SO LOVING THE WORLD; and that his successive generations are to walk abroad, when purified here, over the distant places of the creation for illimitable ages: then it is apparent that the mystery departs from the permission of evil; and we may make the clear deduction from the facts, that EVIL WAS A SYSTEM INSTITUTED FOR THE GOOD OF MAN." —Pp. 373, 374.

He thus maintains that God placed man in conditions in which sin was both unavoidable and expedient, and that he thereby expressly "instituted evil for the good" of the race. He holds, accordingly, that it would have been an irreparable calamity, a catastrophe that would have spread a direful blight over God's whole empire, had our first parents maintained their allegiance, and secured their posterity thereby in holiness and happiness through their endless existence!—his theory being, not that sin is overruled for the benefit of unfallen worlds, but of man himself, and is to each individual essential, as a means of holiness and happiness. To fail of it, were to fail of the very end of

his being—were to disqualify himself for the service and enjoyment for which his Creator formed him. But this is to maintain that sinning is not only desirable and expedient, but a duty. It is to fill exactly the office, to a certain point at least, which holiness, according to the Scriptures, should fill. It is a link in a chain of acts, without which the soul can never be united to God. It is, therefore, obligatory, and obligatory at least in every instance where there is a temptation to sin, and in every form to which temptations prompt. For, if the violation of the law of God is expedient and essential to one's well-being in any one instance, no one can know that it is not equally so in any other. Mr. Hequembourg's doctrine thus yields the most unmitigated license to evil. It openly assigns to revolt from God, and war on him and his kingdom, the office of submission to his sceptre, and installs sin in all the forms in which men may choose to perpetrate it, in the place of obedience! There is not a shape that rebellion ever assumed, there is not a crime, however enormous, against man, nor an impiety, however revolting, against God, that may not find in it a justification. The cheat, the thief, the calumniator, the

the depravity in our flesh; but it made no invasion of his superior nature."—P. 108.

"The Saviour assumed our actual humanity, our humanity in its weakness and evil; was tempted, we are told, in all points like as we are, yet without sin; and knows from an experience of human evil, in the language of the Scriptures, how to succor and sympathize with our tempted nature.

"Let no one be startled with the fact that the Saviour assumed our *fallen* humanity, for such it was. He was, for a time, a man subject to like evils with us."—P. 382.

"The assumption of our weak humanity shows in the most affecting manner, that, however unfortunate in any respect may be our experience of evil, *the Son of God came and shared it with us.*"—P. 383.

The human nature which the Eternal Word assumed, comprised a soul as well as a body. To hold, therefore, that the nature which he assumed was fallen like ours, is to hold that he came into life under the curse which is devolved by Adam's fall upon all his posterity; and that would involve at least the commencement of his mental existence in total preclusion from the Spirit of God: and the commencement of his bodily life under a sentence to death because of Adam's sin. But the first is not only against the Scriptures, which exhibit him as enjoying the gift of the Spirit without measure; and inconsistent with his union with the Word; but would render it impossible for Mr. Hequembourg, on his principles, to prove that Christ did not actually sin like other men. For he maintains that a human being just entered into existence, must by the necessity of his nature and condition, sin; that God himself cannot prevent it; and that an experience of sin is indispensable to the possibility of a subsequent obedience. As Christ's human soul, therefore, had no experience of any sort antecedent to his birth, and, according to Mr. H., had no aid from the Spirit, he must, on Mr. H.'s theory, unavoidably have fallen into sin. Mr. H., indeed, represents Christ as not sinning; but it is only by disregarding the express doctrine of his theory that a moral being, coming into existence as Christ did, must, from the necessities of his nature, and in order to the possibility of subsequent holiness, fall into sin; and sin often and long, and in very open and guilty forms.

He asserts, also, that Christ assumed our nature with the advantage of *a previous experience;* by which he means, doubtless, a previous experience of evil; as that is *the* experience which he represents as essential to every moral being in order to the possibility of his becoming obedient. It implies, therefore, that he regards Christ as having fallen into sin anterior to his assumption of our nature. Whether he supposes Christ's soul had had a previous existence and probation, in which it had fallen, he does not directly indicate; nor, whether that is his belief or not, how the supposition that his soul had an experience of evil anterior to his assumption of our nature, is reconcilable with his theory that there is no other order of created intelligences in the universe than men, except angels. Does he hold that Christ's soul had had a previous existence, and had fallen; or does he maintain, with Dr. Bushnell, that Christ had no human or angelic soul, but was a mere incarnation of the divine nature in a human body? Whichever his theory may be, in his ascription to him of a previous experience of evil, he represents him as having become a sinner anterior to his human incarnation, and thus exhibits him as wholly

lessness, and inacquaintance with all the high and pure enjoyments of holy intelligences, with the most uncultured of the race at the present day.

"Very remarkable misconceptions in general are had of the state of our first parents in Eden. . . . We carry the idea of Adam's natural perfection to an extent which equals him with the highest and most cultivated intelligence of the present. But how incompatible even his external condition was with such a conception, may be apparent by considering how many things he wanted which belong to the condition of civilized people at present. He had no railroads, nor any roads. He had not learned to train a horse, or yoke an ox, or milk a cow. His dwelling, whatever it was, cannot be conceived to have been a palace of marble or wood. He was ignorant of the use of iron, or any other metal."—P. 136, *note.*

This passage presents a very accurate gauge of Mr. Hequembourg as a philosopher and theologian. For first he proceeds in it on the assumption that the degree in which the arts of agriculture, mechanics, architecture and taste are known to individuals and communities, is a measure of their intellectual and moral elevation. Was it so with the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Tyrians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans? Were not the periods of their greatest advancement in arts and sciences, the periods of their greatest moral debasement, and of their most open and impassioned apostasy from Jehovah to the worship of false gods? Have not the purest and noblest examples of piety our world has witnessed been presented by persons of the most simple lives; unacquainted with the conveniences of modern art, and the refinements and splendor of gorgeous courts? Abraham, Job, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Naomi, Ruth, Zachariah, and Elizabeth; Mary, the mother of Jesus; John Baptist, the apostles, and thousands and millions of the witnesses of Jesus, who from age to age have been put to death by the great and powerful, or driven to fly to the seclusion of wildernesses for safety, and waste their days in want and suffering? And next he assumes in it, that railroads and other engines and works of art were as essential to the convenience and happiness of Adam and Eve, as they are to their posterity now; as though Adam and Eve

were under any necessity of making long and rapid journeys to different parts of the earth, and had produce to transport to market, and fellow consumers to purchase it! On the same principles Mr. Hequembourg might maintain that the angels are in a state of barbarism, unless they have tame animals to assist them in their labors, are familiar with the use of iron, and have roads, and cars, and ships driven by steam to carry them from one place to another in the orbs they inhabit! He goes on:—

"If, therefore, we should take an imaginary journey to Eden, and find our first parents absolutely naked, and without the slightest conception of the use of dress, and without the appliances of thread and needle (if such a use had been known), and had seen them sitting upon the ground, or on a stone, or a tree-root, and reposing at night on the bare earth, or in a cave, we should form no very high expectations of their intelligence, and should expect to find *geology* and *astronomy* things unknown to Adam; and Eve as destitute of any cultivated taste as any of her daughters would be without education and self-exertion. We might feel a momentary pain as we saw our progenitors in

mere children, slowly and imperfectly, by the use of external means. He denies the possibility of inspiration. He denies, from the limitations of their nature, the possibility of their having been at once raised, by any means natural or divine, to lofty and comprehensive thoughts and fervid and glowing affections. He, of course, does not regard them, in their trial, as representatives of their offspring, and determining their moral condition by their fall. He holds that their posterity universally would have fallen, even on the supposition that the parents had maintained their allegiance; that notion being involved in the doctrine that all moral beings must necessarily, from the ignorance and weakness in which they commence their life, fall into sin.

VII. He accordingly holds that sin, in its early stages, involves no rejection of God, or alienation from him, but springs from mere weakness, inexperience, and misjudgment.

"The primitive man was not deceived. He did not deny his Creator's goodness nor doubt his power. He did not set up a rebellion from his own instigation, from pride, or self-importance. He yielded to other causes. Nor could anything more effectually show that the weakness of Adam consisted in his want of experience.

"Since also the fall was from weakness, and was not a pure act of malicious wickedness, the Creator undoubtedly had important reasons for banishing the man, and *continuing his condemnation.* It is not with us, upon any sound principle of reasoning, to say that the man, fallen from weakness and from his passions, might not have been set up again, and tried anew. The doctrine of atonement does not oppose this idea, since it emanated from the love of God, and not from an abstract principle of justice; and the Divine pity might have raised the fallen man in some way again, and tried him anew. But such was not the good pleasure of God."—Pp. 161, 162.

He thus represents that there was nothing in the sin of Adam that was necessarily a ground of condemnation, and needed an expiation in order to its being forgiven. Adam, he holds, might, with perfect propriety, have been put on a new probation, as though that which had already taken place had determined nothing. But that is to deny that

there was any moral evil in his transgression; and exhibit it as like an involuntary stumble that throws one to the earth, a careless inadvertence, a misfortune, instead of a crime. It implies, therefore, that the trial of Adam was, in fact, no decisive trial. It only demonstrated his inexperience and weakness. It formed no test of his character. It presented no proof of a hopeless alienation from God. It constituted no ground of certainty that the acts that followed it would not be holy instead of sinful. It exhibits the penalties, therefore, that followed his trangression as wholly arbitrary and unjust. For what could be more inequitable than to doom Adam and Eve to death, as a righteous punishment, because of an act to which no guilt whatever attached; and that presented no barrier to their being still treated as though they had not passed through a probation! But this is to reject the representation of the Scriptures, and exhibit the whole system of redemptive measures consequent on the fall, as proceeding on a false basis. It was not necessary that Adam should be prompted in his first sin by a direct and exacerbated hatred of God, in order that it might involve great guilt, and be a just ground of condemnation. It was enough that in it he deliberately disregarded God's will, and made his own selfish desire, though conscious that it was at war with God's will, the reason of his act. He assumed in it a hostile attitude to God. He chose his own wishes as his law, instead of God's; and fell accordingly from allegiance; and that fall was a proper ground for the penalty with which he was smitten.

VIII. In harmony with and as a ground of his notion on this subject, Mr. H. maintains that Adam was not at the time of the fall under a moral law, and that no moral law was violated by his transgression.

"It is very true that death was threatened to Adam if he broke over one prohibition. This might appear at first, and without particular attention, to impart to the government of Eden a purely legal character. But a little attention will, it is believed, remove this error. It cannot be that nothing besides eating the forbidden fruit could have produced the Divine displeasure, and that nothing else could have caused at any subsequent time the death of Adam. The whole sphere of the duties of our first parents could not have been confined to a single prohibition

leaving nothing positive to be done, and nothing to produce the divine disapprobation. The regulations of Eden, therefore, were not those of pure law, unless it can be shown that the moral law, in all its extent, was really instituted there. But the penalty of death was not for breaking the moral law, but for eating of the forbidden tree. What would have happened to our progenitors if they had made an idol or broken the Sabbath, if it was instituted there, we are not informed; but undoubtedly some corrective measure would have been employed. But correction is not a part of law. It cannot be supposed that our first parents were capable only of the negative parts of a moral character, or of one negative part only, and that all they could do was not to eat of the tree. It cannot be supposed that they would have been incapable of keeping the Sabbath, or of doing any other positive duty, and that they were wholly incapable of regulating their affections. It must be obvious, therefore, that it is a misconception to regard the paradisiacal state as one of pure law. The prohibition must be regarded as simply a test; and it will subsequently be seen to bear the character of a test, designed to bring the case of our first parents to an immediate issue."

. . . "It does not follow that the prohibition of Eden came up to the entire capacity of our first parents. It did not embrace the elementary principle of virtue any farther than obedience is one. It did not inculcate, except indirectly, the obligation to love God supremely, nor the other part of the moral law. But it cannot be supposed that our first parents were incapable of fulfilling these obligations in any degree. It is plain, therefore, that the government of Eden was not that of a pure legal system, and that the prohibition not to eat of the forbidden fruit was not the institute of such a system."—Pp. 138–140.

Mr. Hequembourg, to gain the object at which he aims here, presents quite a different estimate of the capacity of our first parents from that which he advanced on a preceding page. There they were wholly devoid of moral ideas. God himself was incapable of communicating them to them, either by his own voice, the voice of angelic messengers, or the inspiring influences of the Holy Spirit. The only method by which such ideas could be acquired, was a slow and long-continued experience, and an experience of sin and its penal consequences. Now they have become endowed with such a measure of knowledge, and have reached such a con-

sciousness of their relations to God that they are capable of a direct, intelligent, and eminently virtuous obedience to all the great laws of a moral code.

He is, however, as mistaken now, in the inference he draws from the moral capacity of Adam and Eve, as he before was in denying to them all knowledge of their relations and obligations to God. The fact that while competent to render a spotless obedience to all other laws imposed on them, such as loving, acknowledging, and worshipping God, loving each other, sanctifying the Sabbath, keeping the garden,—the penalty of death was annexed only to the prohibition to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, does not prove or imply that they were not under a moral and religious law. The reason that the sentence of death was not annexed to the breach of those commands, doubtless was, that they, while in innocence, were in no temptation directly to violate them. They could have no temptation to hate God, in place of loving him, on the ground of his character, his relations to them, or his providence over them. In all those relations the direct, simple

fell was of a wholly different character, and owed its triumph to a different consideration. It was consequent on Eve's fall, and sprang, doubtless, from his love of her and reluctance to lose her. He was brought to the choice of maintaining his allegiance to God, and submitting to the anguish and horror of surrendering her to death, and being left to solitude; or of renouncing his fidelity to God, and sharing with her the consequences of rebellion. It was not, therefore, to gain a religious blessing imagined to be couched in the knowledge of good and evil. It was not to gain any higher measure of any species of happiness. Instead, it was a deliberate relinquishment of the favor of God, and all the blessings involved in it, and plunge of himself and his posterity into sin, misery, and death, rather than surrender the society and love of his fallen wife. His resolving to eat the forbidden fruit was, therefore, a direct and formal renunciation of God, and choice, instead, of a fallen creature as his portion, notwithstanding the penal consequences that were to follow in its train. No act, therefore, can be conceived in which a more direct and intelligent choice is made between obeying and disobeying God; none which would present a more specific and decisive test of allegiance. It is wholly mistaken, then, to maintain that he did not act under a positive moral law. No other act of transgression was ever exerted in our world that involved, on the one hand, so open and emphatic a renunciation of allegiance to him, and choice of a creature as an object of supreme love; and, on the other, such a sacrifice of the well-being of others—a whole race—for the gratification of the transgressor's selfish wishes. It was as pre-eminent, in those respects, above all others, as it was in the boundless mischief that sprang from it.

To maintain that Adam, while in Eden, was not under a law, is, moreover, to maintain, that had he abstained from eating the forbidden fruit, it could not have formed any ground for his justification. It would have been, it is implied, a mere abstinence from transgression, not a positive obedience to commands, that would constitute a reason for acceptance and reward. It could not, therefore, have been any ground even for exemption from further trial, and especially could not constitute any adequate reason for exempting

the whole race from the dangers of a violent trial, confirming them in holiness, and exalting them to happiness. Mr. Hequembourg's theory is thus, at every point, at war with the word of God.

IX. He maintains that the administration under which Adam and Eve were placed anterior to their fall, was gracious, and not legal.

"It would be a mistake to suppose that men were ever essentially governed upon any other principle than one of grace; by which we mean the system of evangelical government, in which the love of God is the great force. Men have been saved by grace in all ages. A part of the reasoning of Paul, when demonstrating by his powerful arguments the necessity of faith, is, that a system of law, as the only governing principle, addresses self-interest, and cannot, therefore, be admitted as a principal measure in the divine economy. Such reasoning applies as well to an unfallen as to a fallen state. Moral beings can never be governed exclusively by a principle which does not admit of their greatest elevation, or which allows them to boast before God, as the apostle tells us would be the effect of a legal system. A legal system would put in a condition to demand, as a right, the

not find the principles of this objectionable and narrow philosophy applicable to any measure employed by Infinite Wisdom for the government of Adam. The threatening of death which was made does not involve the institution of a system of law, since penalties are used in domestic government where no one would conceive that a legal system is or ought to be dominant. We love and obey our parents as we love and obey God; because, as a matter of fact, they first love us. Genuine obedience and duty are the, so to speak, spontaneous, and not calculating, reciprocations of love."—Pp. 141–143.

The confusion and self-contradiction that reign in this passage, bespeak an extraordinary inadequacy to the discussion of such a subject. No grosser solecism surely was ever uttered, than that obedience to law from the mere motives which the law presents, can only spring from "a mean and calculating selfishness." For it implies that, to love God with all the heart and mind, and soul and strength, as being, and because of his being what he is, is not to love *him*, and for his excellence; but is only to love the reward which is promised to the supreme love of him. The mind must be sadly bewildered that cannot see the distinction between these, and feel its propriety and importance. Besides, if obedience to a law cannot be rendered because of the rectitude and propriety of the duty commanded, but can only spring from a selfish regard to the reward which it promises, must not a love to God for blessings that have already been received, whether as rewards or gifts of grace, spring equally from a mean and calculating selfishness? If the reason of the love is a favor, is it not equally selfish, whether the favor has already been received or is still contemplated as future? His objection, if legitimate, is clearly as fatal to a government of grace as it is to a government of law.

But his theory that the system of Eden was a system of grace, and not of law, is fraught with a still more revolting solecism. For it implies that Adam and Eve were sinners, apart from their eating the forbidden fruit; and thence sinners by violating other commands of a far higher moral cast, according to Mr. Hequembourg, than the prohibition of that fruit; and consequently, that there was a provision in that code for their forgiveness and justification, without any expia-

tion for their sins, or any righteousness of a surety for their justification. But that is to contradict in the most open manner the whole representation of the Scriptures, which exhibit the government under which Adam and Eve were placed in Eden, as a law; and contravene the principle also on which, after their fall, grace was exercised towards them and their posterity, and is now exercised towards the race. The sacred word everywhere represents the obedience and death of Christ as the sole medium of that grace. Where does Mr. Hequembourg learn that, before the fall, there was another and different method for the recovery of the race, by grace, from the dominion of sin and its curse? If he has authority for his doctrine, why does he not quote it, in place of building on false metaphysics, which he usually denounces with so much vehemence? If the first pair were under a system of grace at their trial, and fell under that system, why, if legitimate, was it not made the medium of their redemption after their fall? It must have been weak indeed, if inadequate to the forgiveness of an act, that, according to Mr. Hequembourg, was not, in fact, a violation of law, involved no guilt, and was no barrier

disorder of his nature, and the word and providence of God alike condemning it, than that from a state of innocence he should corrupt himself with feeble convictions of the evil. Our natural depravity, and the Adamic history, may now both be called an experience of great value. The mystery of the fall, considering it as a part of the divine plan, vanishes in this way of viewing it, and becomes an event, regarding it as belonging to the providence of God, benevolent and beneficial in *its character*."—P. 159.

It bespeaks a bewildered and presumptuous mind surely, to pronounce the condition of a race, under a fall, better than in innocence; in alienation from God, and under a curse, than in acceptance and the enjoyment of his favor! If this be true of the race collectively, and of each individual of it, is it not to be supposed that it is equally true of each individual at every stage of his progress in evil; and every instance of sin, no matter how impious its form and flagrant its guilt, be held to be beneficial in its character to the perpetrator? How can Mr. Hequembourg shield his theory from the charge of involving this revolting consequence? He cannot. If sin, as he affirms, is not only beneficial but essential to the possibility of holiness; if its usefulness in the experience of it and its consequences by the agent who perpetrates it is, as he maintains, indubitable, he cannot show that the experience of it at the time and in the form of every individual transgression is not essential to the possibility of the subsequent obedience of him who exercises it. His doctrine is therefore a license to all sin. It takes it out of the category of crime, converts it into an indispensable means to the best possible end, and thereby makes perseverance in it essential till holiness is attained. And is not that to make it expedient, if not obligatory, at every stage of the sinner's progress? If the practice and experience of sin is the only means that can bring the transgressor to repentance, and his past experience of it is not sufficient to produce that result, what can be plainer, than that he must go on to greater and more revolting sins, in order to raise his experience to the intensity that is requisite to his turning to obedience? Yet this principle is a prime element in Mr. Hequembourg's theological system. He denies that God can create beings with

such powers and sensibilities that he can immediately communicate to them all kinds and degrees of knowledge that are requisite to their exercising a pure and lofty obedience. He maintains that moral creatures must necessarily commence their life in total ignorance of their moral relations and duties, and inability to reach any cognizance of them except through a slow experience, and experience of sin and its penal consequences. It follows, of course, that in proportion as holiness is desirable and obligatory, in that proportion sin, which is its necessary antecedent, is expedient and necessary, and necessary till it reaches that measure that the scale turns to the side of holiness. No theory, however, can be in more open contradiction to the Scriptures, and to experience. The effect of sin on the perpetrator—when left without the Spirit of God—is not to soften, but to harden, to blunt the moral sensibilities, to extinguish conscience, to inflame the passions, to beget the hope of impunity, and thus bind the soul in a helpless vassalage to evil.

XI. He does not regard Christ as having died as our substitute, and to make expiation for our sins. He uses the word expiation indeed, propitiation, and atonement, but not in the sense of the Scriptures, to denote an endurance of the penalty of the law in our place, and in our behalf, so that we are cleansed and justified by his blood. Instead he holds with many modern rationalists of Germany, that Christ died simply to show his sympathy and love by sharing in the sufferings with which we are smitten in consequence of our sins.

"It is not with us upon any sound principle of reasoning to say, that the man fallen from weakness and from his passions might not have been set up again and tried anew. The doctrine of *atonement does not oppose this idea*, since it emanated from the *love* of God, and not from *an abstract principle of justice;* and the Divine pity might have raised the fallen man in some way again, and tried him anew."—Pp. 161, 162.

This is saying that justice presented no barrier to the exemption of man, at his fall, from all penal evils, as consequences of his sinning! But that is to say, that the infliction

of evils on him as a penalty of his sin was unjust; implies, accordingly, that the infliction of death on Christ, as his substitute, or on account of his sin, would have been unjust; and therefore denies that his death was vicarious and expiatory.

"It is a clear part of the Scripture's teachings that the Son of God took our actual nature, was clothed in actual flesh—in short, assumed humanity, was a man, and will ever remain such—a lofty, superior, and extraordinary member of the human family. He is a man on his superior throne; and the glorious expectation is assured us in the gospel, that we shall be raised to a participation in his glorious humanity hereafter, as he descended once to a lowly participation in our own. This subject is one of the most extraordinary and consoling doctrines of revelation. Who cannot look from a deified humanity appearing on earth to an extraordinary destiny of redeemed man? If God, after the epoch of the creation, in its resting period, collected his glories in the body of a man, and rendered himself representatively a member of our race, he showed in this act, in no dubious manner, the destiny of mankind. *This is the great stand-point of religion.* With this lever we uplift the world of evil, and look abroad upon a glorious and emancipated future."—Pp. 381, 382.

"The assumption of our weak humanity shows in the most affecting manner, that however unfortunate in any respect may be our experience of evil, *the Son of God came and shared it with us.* The burden of this calamity becomes lighter under such a fact. The Son of God descended from his high estate, and cast around him the mantle of our miseries, and plunged into the depths of poverty and sufferings, for whatever other reasons to offer us, the Scriptures assert, the consolations of his sympathy. The subject approaches its richest point of elucidation, when the wisdom and glory of the Creator, who appointed our lot of evil, becomes allied in a bodily manner with our sufferings. Were we able to offer no other solution, here we would rest our implicit faith."—Pp. 383–384.

The meaning of this is that he regards this theory as presenting the only solution of Christ's incarnation and death; namely, that he assumed our nature and died, that he might manifest his sympathy with us in our sin and misery, and show us what we ought and what we are to be. But this

is not only against the clearest teachings of the Scriptures, which everywhere represent that he gave himself a ransom for us; that he died, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God; that his blood cleanseth from all sin, and that we are justified by his blood; and that there is no name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ: but it is self-contradictious and absurd. His assumption of our nature, and submission to the scorn, enmity, and malice of men, and allowing himself to be put to death by them on the cross, could form no expression of sympathy with, nor love to us, if it contributed nothing by the expiation of our sins to our redemption—if it left us precisely where we were before, except that it occasioned a vast augmentation of the guilt of those who rejected, persecuted, and crucified him. Instead, it would appear an infinite mockery, as it would imply that omnipotence, boundless wisdom, and infinite love were either incapable or indisposed to take any effective measures to accomplish our redemption from sin and its curse! It would be a gratuitous addition to the sum of sin and of suffering,

to the throne of heaven, and investiture with supreme and absolute power, that is utterly inadequate to contribute in the least degree to the restoration of the fallen to holiness and bliss! But Mr. Hequembourg's conceptions of the work of redemption are at every point at the greatest distance from the teachings of reason and the divine word.

XII. He makes no recognition of the office of the Holy Spirit in the renovation and sanctification of the mind. His system precludes it. If, as he maintains on the one hand, the sole reason that men sin is the weakness of their nature, and their want of experience; and on the other, God is unable directly to communicate knowledge to them; and they are incapable of acquiring moral ideas except through the medium of experience and culture, there plainly is no place for the intervention of the enlightening, renewing, and sanctifying influences of the Spirit. Men are themselves the authors of their renovation, if they are the subjects of such a change—not the new-creating and life-giving Spirit. This he indicates in many passages.

"As we have seen, . . . evil had its actual birth in the weakness of a creature which was to *learn* and to *derive its wisdom from experience*."—P. 364.

"Nor does man become debased, nor the divine justice disparaged, by the mere existence of physical and moral evil in human nature and around it. We invoke a moment's attention to *the true notion of our moral condition*. We may *theoretically, if we choose*, regard the world as naturally sentenced to death. This is the condition in which divine wisdom has seen good to place us. All mankind are afflicted with moral disorders from their birth, and all die. But this is a condition not absolute; it is affected by the condition of receiving the light of tradition and of the gospel. In short, it is a condition from which we are *voluntarily to extricate ourselves* by the gospel."

"Now there is nothing debasing to man in the fact that he is placed in difficulties and dangers from which *he is to emerge*. Nor is there anything disparaging to the wisdom of God in the fact that these natural dangers and difficulties exist, if they are *causes necessary to excite him to responsible and virtuous action*, and if they are not charged upon him *as crimes*."

"The Saviour, in several declarations, very plainly assures us, that men become guilty only by rejecting the means of their salvation: in short, that our moral condition is essentially *neutral* until we accept or reject our opportunities of *mercy*."—Pp. 377, 378.

"Our moral condition," he thus holds, is absolutely neutral, up to the moment that we either accept or reject salvation through Christ. There is, then, up to that moment, no need of renovation. There is no stony heart to be taken away. There is no need of the gift of a new heart of flesh. The only evils of our condition are difficulties and dangers; and they, instead of being debasing, disparaging, and chargeable on us as crimes, are indispensable as means to excite us to responsible and virtuous action! In place, therefore, of there being any necessity for the renovating agency of the Spirit, such an agency would be of the greatest possible disadvantage; as it would render us incapable of obedience, by putting us out of the condition that is essential to our exercising it. Such are the portentous extravagances to which Mr. Hequembourg's speculations carry him. Man must continue under the unmitigated power of sin, in order that he may be delivered from it! To be renewed after God in knowledge and righteousness would be a fatal obstacle to his restoration to holiness!

XIII. If sin is so great a good; if its presence is so indispensable to the possibility of obedience, it is not to be supposed that its reign here is ever to cease. Its extinction would be an infinite disaster, as it would bring the work of redemption to a pause, and intercept from holiness countless millions of beings who otherwise will become partakers of salvation.

"The Scriptures do not teach that evil will ever be separated from the condition of mankind upon the earth, let their existence here run on to whatever duration it may."

"The question therefore is, why the existence of evil, to be perpetual to some extent in this world, should have been allowed?"—Pp. 89, 90.

And it is requisite, he maintains, because man being, as he holds, the only moral creature that multiplies by genera-

tion, his perpetuation in a fallen life, is needful in order to such an augmentation of moral subjects, as is necessary to form an empire commensurate with the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Creator. In this he sets aside the great prediction couched in the Lord's Prayer, that a time is to come when the will of God will be done on earth as it is done in heaven; when all shall know him; when all shall be righteous; and when there shall be no more curse; but sorrow, crying, exhausting toil and death shall be no more; and all the evils of sin, and sin itself shall have passed away, and all things have become new. The thought of such a redemption of the race appals Mr. Hequembourg. It would eclipse, he thinks, the glory of the Almighty. It would shroud the universe in darkness, as it would leave its countless worlds, built, as he holds, to be peopled by man, untenanted,—a resplendent waste, a gorgeous abortion.

XIV. As this theory of the perpetual reign of sin and death in our world, is irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Scriptures that Christ is to come a second time to put an end to them, and to make the earth the dwelling-place of righteousness and peace, Mr. Hequembourg denies his second personal coming, and maintains that his coming is a mere figurative advent, and took place at the destruction of Jerusalem.

"We have seen that the coming of Christ was not intended to be literal. The style of the prophecy was in agreement with the dispensation under which it was made. . . . It was proper, therefore, that he should speak under the cloud, which would break away in the brightness of his coming . . . . We have seen, however, that the Saviour predicted his actual enthronement, or coming as the promised royal Messiah, while some of the generation which he addressed remained still alive. By universal agreement everything points to the destruction of Jerusalem at the time when he came, if he came at all. And he actually came then, according to the intention of his prediction, or else *the reconciliation of the Scriptures with one another is impossible, and the words of the Redeemer of mankind must be classed with the idle tales of weak and deluded humanity.*

"Nor can there be any other than a *second* coming, without equally destroying the truth of the Scriptures. The second coming is represented as decisive for the great purposes of the

divine economy in the world. Paul speaks of this event as the coming the second time. *The Saviour can never be expected, therefore, to come in a personal manner. His second coming has, at least, as regards the beginning or inauguration of the event, been accomplished, and no other is predicted in the Scriptures.*"—Pp. 247, 248.

In how little respect Mr. Hequembourg holds the words of Christ, and how ready he is to reject the testimony of the Scriptures whenever it interferes with his speculations, the reader may see from this passage. To set aside the great prediction of Christ's second personal coming is indispensable to the support of his theory; whether Christ's second coming is to be, as antimillenarians hold, the tragedy of this world by its conflagration, putting an end to the multiplication of the race, and the removal of both the good and the evil to other scenes of existence; or as the Scriptures foreshow, to redeem the race at length from the reign and curse of sin, and restore it to perfect holiness and bliss. If the multiplication of the race is to be brought to an end, then Mr. H.'s theory falls, that it is by the endless augmentation of mankind that the universe is to be peopled. If it is to be restored from the blight of the fall to holiness and blessedness; then his theory of the necessary fall of all moral beings who come into existence, and of the indispensableness of their fall to their ultimate holiness, is equally overthrown. In order, therefore, that Mr. H. may save his system from confutation, the prediction of Christ's second personal coming must be blotted from the Bible. How then does he attempt to accomplish it?

First, by maintaining that there are no settled usages, or invariable rules by which the meaning of prophetic language is to be determined.

"Prophetical language is not hieroglyphical, but allegorical. In other words, there is no conventional prophetic usage which will in all cases explain the prophetic writings. Much of the prophecies is indeed in the condition of those hieroglyphical inscriptions, where the figures are used in remote tropical meanings, at present unintelligible from the want of a key. We must therefore search in each prophecy itself, and in the circumstances in which it was delivered, for *the particular key* of its explanation."—P. 237.

But if this be so, it overthrows, in place of sustaining Mr. Hequembourg's construction. For if there are no fixed principles by which the language of the prophecies is to be interpreted, but each prophecy requires a peculiar key to its meaning, because its terms and expressions are employed on a principle peculiar to itself, how is Mr. Hequembourg to demonstrate that his interpretation of any one of them is correct? He plainly cannot. If there are no established and invariable laws of language, by which the interpreter is to be guided; if he is to proceed on principles that are novel and applicable in no other case; it is clear that he can never verify those principles, inasmuch as he has no indubitable and invariable standard by which he can test them. All consequently must be mere assumption or conjecture.

Next, this preposterous dogma, however, he overthrows, in the same paragraph, by declaring that "prophetical language," instead of being used at random, without any fixed law, "is allegorical;" for the allegory is framed on clear and invariable principles, and admits of the most easy and demonstrative interpretation. And, moreover, if the prediction of Christ's second coming, to which Mr. Hequembourg refers, Matt. xxiv. 30, is, as he claims, allegorical, it is indisputable that the coming which it foreshows is to be a personal and not a mere providential one;—as it is the law of the allegory that agents represent agents, acts acts, and effects and consequences, effects and consequences. The personal coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, must denote a visible personal coming then, not a not-coming; nor any impersonal occurrence of a wholly different nature; and the representative acts and consequences of his coming, must denote corresponding acts and consequences of a real personal coming. To place any other construction on it, if allegorical, were to violate its meaning as absolutely as it is to violate the meaning of an unfigurative passage to reject its grammatical sense, and attempt to fasten on it some tropical signification that is wholly inconsistent with the principles on which its terms are used.

To suppose that the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, if held to be allegorical, can mean the destruction of Jerusalem, is in equal

contradiction to the law of the allegory, by which the act or event represented must bear an analogy to that which represents it. But there is no likeness between the coming of Christ in the glory of the Deity, to raise his dead saints and establish his kingdom on the earth, and the capture and sack of Jerusalem by the Romans. They are of the greatest possible dissimilarity.

Mr. Hequembourg, however, ere he had completed his next page, presents, instead of the destruction of Jerusalem, a wholly different event as that which the coming of Christ foreshows.

"We cannot doubt, therefore, that the coming of Christ is *an advent of his word and promises*, or *a regeneration of the world by the gospel.* The increasing power of Christian truth and of Christian virtue will destroy all their enemies, or unseat them."—P. 249.

These events not only bear no analogy to Christ's personal coming, but are wholly dissimilar. An advent of his word—that is, its proclamation—is not the same event as the regeneration of the world by it. His word was proclaimed on the day of Pentecost, and for a series of years afterwards, by chosen ministers, who were attested by miraculous gifts; but it did not regenerate the world. Nor has it in any of the ages since, nor proved efficacious, even with the mighty influences of the Spirit, to more than a small proportion of those to whom it has been made known.

Mr. H.'s attempt to put aside the great doctrine of Christ's second personal coming is nothing else than an effort, by unscholarly and discreditable pretexts, to divest the prediction, Matt. xxiv. 30; Rev. i. 7, and others of the kind, of their grammatical meaning, and substitute in its place a fictitious and ungrammatical sense. The assumptions on which he builds his construction would, if legitimate, divest language universally of all certainty of meaning. It were no more a misrepresentation of Mr. Hequembourg's volume to assert that it is made up of unintelligible allegories, and that there is no usage by which the meaning of its language can be determined, than it is in him to assert that the predictions in the New Testament of Christ's second coming

are of that character. Why may not the destruction of Jerusalem, the advent of Christ's word and promise, and the regeneration of the world, with just as much propriety be treated as allegorical as Christ's second coming, and Mr. Hequembourg's fancied solution of the prophecy be but another allegory, which is to be solved by a third, and that by a fourth, and so on, *ad infinitum?* In place of indubitably determining the meaning of the prediction, his theory of allegorization would make it impossible that it should ever be determined.

XV. Like Swedenborg, Prof. Bush, and Mr. S. Lee, he denies the resurrection of the body, and maintains that the souls of the departed are invested with new bodies immediately on their entrance into the invisible world.

"As to the reconciliation of the subject with science, the case is difficult only when we conceive that the Scriptures teach the literal recovery, or the resurrection of the old body in every respect. And as to the second coming of Christ—the resurrection must, in order to preserve the truth of the Scriptures, have begun to take place when the Saviour came, soon after his own and the apostles' predictions; and it must have gone on, uninterruptedly, ever since. The resurrection, like the judgment, is a continuous event. It must, therefore, take place in a manner invisible to us; nor is it necessary to conceive that any portion of the matter of the old body—any ponderable element which composes it—should be used in the composition of the new.

"If this is the true idea of the resurrection—as it unquestionably is—the affairs of the world, it is obvious, may continue for ever; its probationary system may continue, the human race be born and die as ever, and all the good go, immediately upon the termination of their earthly state, and with a bodily organization, to populate the distant places of the creation. As we have seen, *it must be taken as a matter of fact* that the resurrection is a continuous event, perpetually and imperceptibly taking place. The first impression of almost every one would be, that much exists in the New Testament inconsistent with such a doctrine. It will be found, however, that this impression is wrong, and has been founded, in great part, upon unexamined traditional explanations. But if the impression should prove correct, *it would be fatal to the inspiration of the New Testament;* for nothing, as we have seen, can be more clearly shown than that the resurrection, like the judgment, was to take place

while some were yet living to whom the Saviour spoke."—Pp. 292, 293.

Mr. H. here again reveals the low estimate in which he holds the authority of the Scriptures. If their doctrines, on any point, contradict his theory, he is ready to deny their inspiration. No such proposition, however, as he represents, has been established by him in respect to the resurrection. He has only put a construction on passages that is at war with their meaning. Thus, the first is Matt. xvi. 27, 28: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." This is a simple prediction that the Son of man shall come in the glory of the Father and give to every one a reward—without defining the time when his coming is to take place. "Verily I say unto you: There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man come in his kingdom." The meaning of this is seen from the parallel passages in the other gospels. "Verily, I say unto you, that there be some that

Hequembourg so confidently avers, that unless his construction of it is correct, as teaching that the resurrection took place at the institution of Christ's kingdom, the inspiration of the New Testament is overthrown. He falls into an equal misconstruction of the other passage, on which he relies to establish his point, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled," Matt. xxiv. 34. Mr. H. assumes that in the all things that were to be fulfilled, before that generation should pass, the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven is included. But that is a mistake. It is the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds, of which the all things predicted as to precede it, were to be the sign, vs. 33. In Luke xxi. 31, instead of signs of his coming being nigh, they are said to be signals that the kingdom of God is nigh; that is in the form it is to assume at Christ's second coming. The all things accordingly that were to be signals of his coming, and were to take place ere that generation passed, were the events predicted as to *precede* his coming, namely—the rise of false Christs, rumors of wars, conflicts between nations, famines, pestilences, earthquakes, persecutions, the prevalence of iniquity, the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, the slaughter and captivity of the Jewish nation; and all those events, in fact, took place in less than forty years, and therefore before the generation contemporary with Christ had passed away. In this passage, moreover, as in the other, there is no allusion to the resurrection of the dead. Such are the factitious grounds on which Mr. H. builds the most portentous conclusions. These passages present no hint that Christ's second coming took place at his institution of his kingdom, immediately before his ascension to heaven, and that the resurrection of the dead began at that epoch, and has continued through the ages that have followed, to the present time; nor are they and innumerable other passages reconcilable with those notions.

He is equally unfortunate in his attempt to sustain his theory by the pretext that the resurrection of the *body* is not even spoken of in the New Testament.

"It should be observed that there surrection of *the body* is never spoken of in the New Testament. Mr. Locke has

observed, that this *expression* is never used, but instead of it, 'the resurrection of the dead,' or from among the dead, is the language employed; and it is also true that the *idea* of the *body* being raised out of the grave is never expressed in the New Testament.

"The resurrection is sometimes spoken of in such a way as not to suggest the idea of rising out of the grave; still the word translated resurrection etymologically imports a standing up, and the idea of rising is very frequently employed. But as the body is not spoken of as being raised, but simply the dead, the idea does not import a rising out of the grave, or the quickening of the matter of the old body. The Saviour says of one that receives him, that he will raise him up at the last day: and in this manner Paul will be found invariably to speak in the 15th chapter of First Corinthians. There is only an apparent exception in this last chapter. 'It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.' But it is evident that body is not the nominative of the verb, which is impersonal. The meaning, therefore, is, 'There is a natural body sown; there is a spiritual body raised.'

"Nothing is more common to us than to speak and think of

that the body which dies, and sinks into dissolution in the grave, is to be the subject of the resurrection in incorruption, just as the mortal body of the believer, who is in life at Christ's second coming, is to be the subject of the change to immortal. "Behold, I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying, death is swallowed up in victory." It is thus explicitly declared that it is the "corruptible" of "the dead in Christ," that must "put on incorruption," just as it is the mortal of the living, that must put on immortality. But the corruptible of the dead in Christ, is their body. To deny it, is not only to contradict the plain grammatical sense of the language, but is to make the soul the subject of the predicates, corruptible and incorruption, plunge into the error of materialism, and exhibit death as an extinction of conscious existence. The passage quoted by Mr. H., "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body;" also, with equal clearness, exhibits the body that is buried, as the body that is to be raised. After affirming that there are heavenly as well as earthly bodies, and that the glory of the heavenly differs from the glory of the earthly, the apostle adds, "and so also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a psychical body; it is raised a spiritual body," vs. 42–44. Here the nominative of the verbs is το νεκρον σωμα. "And so is the resurrection of the dead;"—it, the dead (body of each) is sown, that is, is buried, a psychical body; it—that identical dead body—is raised a spiritual body. It is sown in corruption, in dishonor, in weakness; it is raised in incorruption, in glory, in power. Such is indubitably the grammatical sense. No other can be assigned to the expressions, without the grossest disregard of the laws of the language. What is the nominative

of the verb sown, meaning buried, if it is not the dead body? What is it that is buried in corruption, dishonor, and weakness, if it is not the body of the dead? It is not the soul; for that is not obnoxious to corruption, and is not the apostle's theme; it is the body which is in the process of dissolution, when buried, and is the express subject of the discourse.

In accordance with this, the body of Christ himself which rose, was that identical body which expired on the cross and was buried in the tomb of Joseph. Such is the explicit and uniform representation of the sacred word. Why was it predicted that his flesh should not see corruption, but should be shown the path of life, if it was not to be raised from death? Why did the priests set a guard at the sepulchre, if Christ's prediction of his resurrection was not understood to be a prediction of the resurrection of his body, which was put to death on the cross? Why did the angel roll away the stone from the door of the sepulchre, if the body lying within was not to rise and go forth from its prison? Why did not the body remain in the sepulchre after his resurrection, if it was not the body with which he was then

preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised," 11, 12, 16. Hence the resurrection that was denied was plainly such a resurrection as that of which Christ had been the subject. Otherwise the denial of it would not necessarily have been an absolute denial of his resurrection. It is only on the condition that they are the same, a resurrection of the body that dies to life, that the denial of the one is necessarily a denial of the other. The fact, therefore, that his rising was a resurrection of his body that had been crucified and placed in the tomb, is, according to the apostle's argument, a positive proof that the resurrection of all others will be a rising of their bodies that have died, to a new life; and with this accords all the language of the New Testament. It is the plain doctrine of the passage in which Christ foretells the resurrection of all the dead: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming when all that are in the graves shall hear his voice—the voice of the Son of Man—and shall come forth [from the graves], they who have done good in a resurrection of life, and they who have done evil in a resurrection of condemnation." As they that are to hear his voice and come forth are in the graves, and as there is nothing belonging to the dead in the graves except their dead bodies, can anything be more certain than that it is their dead bodies that are to hear his voice and come forth? It is the doctrine of the passage in which Paul foreshows the resurrection of the dead in Christ before the change of the living. "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not precede them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: afterwards we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air," 1 Thess. iv. 15–17. The scene of this resurrection is to be in this world, not, as Mr. H. fancies, in some other realm of the universe; and the subjects of it are to be the dead, and therefore the dead bodies—not the living, conscious, and

active spirits. Such is the representation also of Dan. xii. 3: "And many of the sleepers in the dust of the earth shall awake—these to everlasting life, those to everlasting shame and contempt." And in harmony with this, the sleep that is predicated of those who are said to have fallen asleep, to sleep, and to sleep in Jesus, is predicated of their bodies, and denotes their repose in death; and the resurrection accordingly that is foretold of them, is the resurrection of their bodies from their death-sleep, to a new and immortal life.

And, finally, the baselessness and error of Mr. Hequembourg's construction of these and other similar passages, is seen from the fact that if it be just, it overthrows his theory that the souls of the dead receive new bodies on their entrance into the invisible world. For whence does he learn that the souls of the dead are to be invested with bodies in the future life, unless it be from these very passages which teach that their resurrection is to be a resurrection of their bodies that die and are buried? He has no other ground for his faith. There are no passages that declare or intimate

bodies, and enter on a new life that is to continue for ever, it would seem very natural that, if they are ever judged, their judgment should take place either before or immediately after death, rather than at a period perhaps ages later. Mr. H. accordingly denies that there is to be any general judgment of the race hereafter, and holds that the only judgment to which they are ever subjected takes place in the providence of God toward them here.

"It would appear that there could remain no doubt upon the mind, from the evidence now collected, that the judgment mentioned as to take place at the Saviour's second coming *began*, when the necessity of the case shows that the Saviour must have come, that is at the destruction of Jerusalem. Then the Jewish nation was terribly judged, and condemned; and their judgment is proceeding now. A judgment of the Gentiles might be regarded as commencing at the same time."—Pp. 271, 272.

"We cannot doubt from the evidence to which we have attended, that the real power of the judgment is the word of God, attended with divine influences; nor that the people of God, as believing and teaching and exemplifying the Scriptures, are *the real judges*, and that the world is assembled before *their tribunal;* nor that the judgments of the church, when proceeding by the word of God, are enforced in the providence of God upon nations and upon individual sinners, especially in *their final ruin.*"—P. 281.

The office of judge is thus transferred by Mr. H. from the Almighty Redeemer to the beings themselves who are to be judged, and the judgment itself, instead of his sentence, is made the mere opinion they entertain of themselves and others! Such declarations as that "God has appointed a day—a specific time—in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom he has ordained," Acts xvii. 31; that there is to be "a day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," Rom. ii. 16; that when the Son of Man comes in his glory, with all his holy angels, he shall sit on the throne of his glory, and all nations —that is, all those in life on the earth—shall be gathered before him, separated one from another, according to their characters, and one class placed on his right, accepted and admitted to his kingdom, and the other set on his left, sen-

tenced to everlasting punishment, Matt. xxv. 31–46, and that at the close of the thousand years' reign the dead, small and great, then remaining in the grave, are to be raised, assembled before the throne, judged out of the things written in the books, "and all whose names are not in the book of life, cast into the lake of fire and brimstone," Rev. xx. 11–15, he holds are no predictions of a general judgment of men hereafter by the Most High. Instead the judgment they foreshow is that which those who belong to the church —a mere fraction of the race—form and express in their opinions in respect to their own and the religious conduct of others! It implies, accordingly, that all the judgments of the church respecting itself, and others—ignorant, false, unjust, and impious as many of them are—are yet truthful and right, being in fact the infallible judgments of God. For is not the Judge of all the earth right in all his judgments? The doctrine has therefore a far-reaching and blasphemous significance; as it makes the acts of men in their judgments—which are the most impious forms their rebellion has ever assumed,—the acts of God, and thence

termined; as he holds that men are on probation after death as well as before, and that none perish except on the ground of a direct rejection of the salvation through Christ.

"It must be admitted that the case of the dead was not, in all instances, fully settled until they had had a trial by the Gospel. . . . We are not warranted in believing that any portion of the truly wicked received [embraced] the message of the Gospel after their death. . . . Certain we may be that the God and merciful Father who extended compassion to those who were some time disobedient before the flood, and remembers his covenant to a thousand generations, will not deal less mercifully with the good heathen, nor with the deceased children of the pious. If Christ saved the good of ante-evangelic ages, who were, nevertheless, deficient in their faith, and saved them by the Gospel, he will doubtless save all *now*, by this means, who enter the eternal world, and are worthy to receive the offer of life. We are told that he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should attain to the blessings of salvation. This is an exalting view of the economy of grace, and raises the Gospel to the point of dignity and *justice* which we feel that it merits." —Pp. 331–333.

This is, undoubtedly, a very close approach to the doctrine of universal salvation. For how can Mr. Hequembourg, on his principle of interpretation, prove that there are any who go into the eternal world who are not "worthy to receive the offer of life?" If, as he holds, the terms in which the endless punishment of the evil is expressed may either mean extinction or endless suffering, can he show that the terms which express their character as wicked do not admit of an interpretation that brings them into the class who, if "deficient in faith," are still worthy to receive an offer of life they will be disposed to accept? He certainly cannot. Besides, on his theory that men sin simply from weakness and inexperience; and that an experience of sin is an indispensable condition of the possibility of holiness, how is he to prove that a continued experience of the evils of sin in the future world will not bring even the most wicked, at length, to holiness? He certainly cannot. To suppose that that should not, sooner or later, be the result, is to contradict the very principle on which his whole sys-

tem rests. To allege the testimony of the Scriptures as the ground of his representation that some are to remain for ever incorrigible, is but a sham; as Mr. Hequembourg shows, at every step in the erection of his theory, that he has no faith in the declarations of the divine word.

XVIII. What now is Mr. Hequembourg's aim in this long series of assaults on the essential doctrines of the Bible, and attempts to substitute a false system in their place? It is to prepare the way for the theory which he has concocted, and which it is the object of his volume to promulgate and recommend, that the grand office, the sublime destiny of our race is to people the universe; that the other orbs owe whatever intelligent inhabitants occupy them, to this; and that the peopling of the countless spheres that wheel in the illimitable realms of space, advances only as death dismisses individuals of our race from life, and they pass to, and assume new bodies in other worlds that are allotted to them as their residence. It is in order to that that he maintains that all moral creatures must necessarily fall, through weakness and inexperience; that falling into sin is necessary to each individual, in order to the possibility of holiness; that the sin of men is never such as to need an expiation in order to its pardon; that no renovation of the mind is necessary to recovery from sin; that there is to be no second coming of Christ, no resurrection, no judgment, and perhaps no perdition. If these points are admitted, then the way he deems is open for the reception of the theory with which he closes his disquisitions, that the great work of our race is to people the universe with intelligences, and that it is in this high office that the reason is seen of all the great arrangements of God's providence, and moral government over our world.

"It has long appeared to the author a remarkable anticipation of a great truth, by the professors of theology at New Haven, in their hypothetical solution of the subject of evil, that God permitted sin to break out in this world, and among angels, in a restricted sphere, and where he could govern it, for the great purpose of his wisdom. This, it is believed, will now be accepted as the true doctrine on the subject. These eminent professors, however, did not pursue the application, nor attain

the verification of their great conjecture. But how great and real does it become when we contemplate man as the being who is to emerge in successive generations from this world of sin and evil, to overspread the universe with his hardly acquired wisdom and virtue.

"Who can doubt that such is the fact? We have no knowledge that any other worlds are inhabited by any other rational beings beside man. The improbability of a different supposition has been conclusively shown in the former part of this work.

"We contemplate an august and inspiring truth! A great cloud of obscurities resting upon the sacred page passes away before it. Theoretically, the mystery has passed, and the full realization will be at length attained. The discoveries of astronomy assume a homelike splendor, and the doctrine of Christ is installed in a central place in the system of truth. Pp. 384, 385.

Such is the oracular air with which he announces this discovery, that, according to him, not only transcends what God has thought proper to reveal, but furnishes the only clue by which the otherwise inexplicable mysteries of his word can be explained! There are several obstacles, however, to its acceptance as a demonstrated truth. First: It is in open contradiction to the divine word, which indicates, in many passages, such as Nehem. ix. 6; Ps. ciii. 20–22; Ephes. i. 20–23; Phil. ii. 9–11; Col. i. 16, that the universe is peopled by many orders of intelligent beings that are not of the human race. Secondly: It has no proof or probability from reason, philosophy, astronomy, which Mr. H. alleges as corroborating it, or any other quarter. Thirdly: Its truthlessness and folly are apparent from the infinite disproportion of the material universe to the numbers of our race that have passed from life, or that are to in millions of ages to come. It were, undoubtedly, greatly to transcend the fact, to suppose the number of human beings who have hitherto passed from life, enough to supply the spheres of our solar system with a population half as large, proportionally to their superficies, as the population of this earth now is to its surface. The superficies of the sun itself is more than a hundred times that of the earth. Five, ten, fifteen thousand years more might, for aught we know, be requisite to furnish that orb and the planets with hosts commensurate with their capacity to yield a proper support

and sphere of activity to bodied intelligences. At that rate, millions on millions of ages would revolve ere a tithe of the orbs of our cloud of worlds would be peopled: and what inconceivable millions ere a tithe of the other clouds of worlds which modern astronomy has discovered, would be occupied? But who knows that the telescope has yet brought a ten thousandth part of the universe to our knowledge? What likelihood is there that were we transported to the remotest cloud of orbs that has yet been descried on the seeming verge of creation, we should not find thousands of other clusters stationed at equal distances beyond; and again and again were we to advance outward from cloud to cloud for ages? Can anything be more repugnant to reason than to suppose that these immeasurable realms are built to remain a desert through infinite ages—resplendent mockeries of the wisdom of their Creator, instead of the residence of intelligences who glorify him by acknowledgement, obedience, and praise? Yet this wretched detraction of the Almighty, is Mr. Hequembourg's pet fancy, the beau-ideal in which his theologic-philosophy culminates.

Our readers must have seen, ere reaching this climax in which his system terminates, that Mr. Hequembourg is not a receiver of the Scriptures as an intelligible and authoritative revelation from God. Instead, he occupies the ground of the mere rationalist, and employs himself, at every step of his disquisitions, in attempting either to set aside or pervert their teachings; and by means of the assumption, first, that they are allegorical throughout, and next that their allegories are formed on wholly different and unintelligible principles, and therefore to be interpreted as the judgment or inclination of the reader may dictate. On this postulate —that the sacred word is to receive its sense from the expositor, not be the medium of imparting the mind of God to him—Mr. Hequembourg finds it as easy to extract his anti-Scriptural, and in the main merely infidel system, from the divine oracles, as any other. And that is the unscholarly and dishonorable process by which he aims to invest his scheme with an air of authority from the word of God. But the artifice is doubtless felt to be essential to his success. By appearing in the garb of a believer in revelation, he may draw many to the acceptance of his views, who, were he to avow his design, would be repelled.

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME XII. APRIL, 1860. NUMBER IV.

ART. I.—DR. FAIRBAIRN'S TYPOLOGY.

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE, Viewed in Connexion with the entire Scheme of the Divine Dispensations, by Patrick Fairbairn, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Free Church, Glasgow. In two volumes, from the third Edinburgh Edition. Philadelphia: William S. and Alfred Martien. 1859.

THIS is a very tasteful edition of a work that appears to have met much acceptance abroad. Fifteen years have passed since the first volume was issued. The second followed two years later. That they have passed to a third edition in Scotland, indicates that the theme is regarded with interest, and that Dr. Fairbairn's views are largely approved. The period that has passed since the composition of the work has allowed him ample opportunity to reconsider the subject. Though on comparing a series of the chapters with those of the first edition, we see he has recast them, in a considerable degree, we do not observe any important modifications of his theory, or improvement in his mode of stating or sustaining it. It is the same in principle and

essentially the same in shape and application as it originally was.

In the January Journal for 1852, our readers will recollect we reviewed it, and pointed out what we regarded as errors in it. Dr. Fairbairn in his third edition refers to the Review, and in a tone that bespeaks offence; and the expedients to which he resorts to depreciate it, indicate a measure of irritation quite unfavorable to his candor and prudence. We regret that he should thus derogate in a degree from the estimate we had formed of him. Our criticism was not only courteous, but forbearing and generous. We indulged in no personal reproaches. So far from it, we spoke of him in terms of commendation, and expressed as appreciative and honorable an estimate of a considerable part of his work, we believe, as it has drawn from the pen of any of his friends. In contrasting him with another class of writers, our language was: "He is a candid and dignified inquirer after truth; he displays a large acquaintance with the Scriptures, conducts his discussions with learning and tact, and presents, on many themes, just and lofty views." And we said of the first half of his second volume, "It might

sanction of the word of God,' but 'one of the boldest and most effective contrivances for its subversion.' This certainly is strong language, yet it is only a fair specimen of the harsh and contemptuous phraseology which pervades the article, and which too commonly characterizes both the pen and the school of the writer. We have no intention of taking any particular notice either of these, or *the palpable misrepresentations* with which they are not unfrequently accompanied. We mean simply to examine the grounds on which the reviewer principally rests his opposition to our topological principles, and succeeds so entirely to his own satisfaction in cutting off much from the typical category in Scripture that we hold to belong to it. So far as we know the subject has nowhere been so fully argued from the same point of view."—Vol. i. p. 37.

Had Dr. Fairbairn informed his readers what the element is of his scheme in respect to which the expressions he here quotes were employed, they would have seen that they are altogether warrantable and appropriate. To have characterized it less strongly, as subversive of the divine word, would have been unfaithfulness to the truth. For the branch of his theory in reference to which they are employed, is the doctrine that the prophecies of the Old Testament that remained unfulfilled at Christ's glorification, were completely changed in their meaning by that event, and became predictions or types rather only of things of a wholly different order, and purely spiritual. Thus he said,

"From the moment Christ was glorified, as the temple and Jerusalem lost their original character, and were no longer the one the proper dwelling-place of Jehovah, the other the chosen city;—the Jerusalem and temple in this sense, then rose heavenward with its divine head, waiting the time of restitution, *it is in that higher region, or in the history and destiny of the New Testament church, that we are to look for what yet remains to be fulfilled of such predictions.*"—Vol. i. p. 510.

"At the very time Daniel was foretelling the desolation that was to come over the material temple, he was intimating the consummation of a new and higher one. And speaking *as he does of the church, in language plainly adapted to the material temple—presenting the spiritual idea under that type and form, he teaches us how to understand such language when used elsewhere;* in other words, *he confirms the principle of interpreta-*

tion, that WHEN *future things are predicted* IN THE SHAPE OF PAST AND EXISTING THINGS, *it is the reproduction,* NOT OF THE OUTWARD AND LITERAL FORM, *but of* THE INWARD AND ESSENTIAL IDEA *that is to be expected.*"—Vol. i. p. 513.

The law of interpretation he advances thus is, that after Christ's glorification, no predictions of things such as already existed, are to be construed as to have their fulfilment in the things they literally foreshow, but only in the inward and essential idea; that is, on his theory, the spiritual things of which those literally predicted are supposed to be types, or representatives.

What then are the things predicted in the Old Testament under the shape of things already existing, the signification of which, according to Dr. F., was changed in that manner? Among them were: 1. The renovation of the mind; for that had already been accomplished in thousands and millions of instances. 2. The destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the discontinuance of the sacrifices and oblations, and the dispersion of the Israelites by the Romans, Dan. ix.

Dan. vii. 13, 14, 27. 14. The resurrection of the holy dead and reign with Christ, Dan. xii. 1–3, vii. 13, 14, 27. 15. The creation of new heavens and a new earth, Isaiah lxv. 17–25. 16. The pouring out of the Spirit on all mankind and gift to them of miraculous powers, Joel ii. 28–32. We might add a great number of others; but these are enough to test Dr. Fairbairn's doctrine. Now, according to him, at Christ's glorification those prophecies lost all their original and proper meaning, and became predictions of wholly different, and merely analogous things of a higher nature; so that we now have no revelation in them respecting the civil rulers of the Roman empire, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the discontinuance of sacrifices and the dispersion of the Israelitish people, the apostasy of the Gentile church, the persecution of the saints by that apostate power, its judgment and destruction, the second coming and reign of Christ, the restoration of Israel, the conversion of the Gentiles and Israelites, the resurrection of the holy dead, or the redemption of the world. Not a whisper is uttered by them on any of these subjects. They relate only to different, higher, and more spiritual events. But can anything be more unwarrantable?

In the first place, it is wholly groundless and arbitrary. He alleges no proof of it, nor could he. There is nothing in the prophecies themselves, or the principles of the divine government, to authorize such an assumption.

In the next place, it is confuted by the fact that a large part of those predictions have been literally fulfilled since Christ's ascension; such as the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the dispersion of the Israelites among the Gentile nations, and in the exact manner foretold by Daniel, ix. 26, 28; Mat. xxiv. 15, their continuance in exile to the present time, the rise and domination over western Europe of the civil rulers symbolized by the ten-horned wild beast, the apostasy of the church, and conversion of itself into a civil power, its persecution of the saints, and the pouring out of the Spirit and bestowment of miraculous gifts on the day of Pentecost, Joel ii. 28–32; Acts ii. 16–21. This last is expressly declared by Peter to be in fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel; and the siege and desolation of Jerusalem, it is foretold by Christ, were to be in accordance with

the prediction of Daniel, Mark xiii. 14; and all the others are equally accomplishments of the predictions in which they are foretold. Will Dr. Fairbairn venture to deny it? Could he offer a grosser contradiction to truth and common sense? If these exact fulfilments of those prophecies, comprising the agency of so many millions of beings, and extending through so many ages, are not accomplishments of them, is it possible to prove that any events are accomplishments and verifications of the predictions in which they are foreshown? May it not with as much reason be denied that the incarnation, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ are verifications of the predictions of those events, and the whole system of prophecy be at a stroke overthrown?

In the third place, it is impossible that this theory can be true, inasmuch as many of these predictions cannot denote a higher class of events than those which they directly foreshow, they being themselves of a purely spiritual nature. Such is the effusion of the Spirit foretold by Joel, on the day of Pentecost, and communication of miraculous

any stage in a series reached the events that were the true and ultimate objects of prediction.

In the fifth place, if the prophecies of the Old Testament have lost their original and genuine meaning, and are now to be interpreted on the principle Dr. Fairbairn asserts, then no one can show that those of the New Testament are not also subject to the same law of construction. It is incredible that they are not. For many of them are predictions of identically the same events as those of the Old Testament; such as the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the career of persons denoted by the wild beast, the persecution of the true worshippers on the one side; and on the other the second coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the effusion of the Spirit on all mankind, the conversion of all nations, the endless life, glory, and reign of the saints. If the prophecies of these events in the Old Testament do not foreshow what they naturally denote, but only a different class of occurrences, how can it be proved that the predictions of the New Testament are not to be interpreted by the same law? What consideration could be alleged against it, that would not be equally applicable to those of the Old Testament? The principle thus strikes from us every certainty derived from the word of God in regard to the future. There is not a prediction or promise left that assures us of that, which, according to the laws of language and symbols, it denotes. We have no testimony from God that we are to exist for ever. We have no certainty, we have not even a hint, that any forgiveness and acceptance are provided for us through the blood and righteousness of Christ. We have no indication that we are to be judged. We have no pledge of a resurrection. We have no knowledge of the purposes of God on any subject. The Bible is turned into an inexplicable enigma, a gorgeous mockery, and God and ourselves wrapt in unmitigated darkness.

Such is a single branch of the system which we characterized by "the phraseology" Dr. Fairbairn denounces as "harsh and contemptuous," and attempts to brand with the discredit of "palpable misrepresentation." We need not appeal to the intelligence and conscientiousness of the reader whether our judgment of his system is not just and

fitly expressed. What scheme ever deserved to be branded as monstrous, if this does not? Of what theory could it be truthfully said, if not of this, that "instead of having the sanction of the word of God, it is one of the boldest and most effective contrivances ever devised for its perversion?" That sentence and its terms are simply expressive of a fact; not exaggerative and harsh. They are the utterance of truth and sobriety, not of misrepresentation or contempt; and they should have roused him to a sense of his responsibility, and prompted him to a reconsideration of the subject, and correction of his mistakes, instead of provoking him to resentment. It makes a very unfavorable impression, that in the presence of this overwhelming demonstration of the error of his theory, in place of recalling it in a spirit of rectitude and meekness, he attempts to veil its revolting character, by an unjust assault on us. That he felt the unanswerableness of our objections seems to be indicated by the exclusion from his last edition of the passages in reference to which we employed the sentences he so strongly resents, and reduction of the appendix from which they were taken, from more

with the representations of Scripture? And will it serve in respect to these as a guiding and harmonizing principle? We might, in a similar way, draw out a series of precise and definite characteristics of Messianic prophecy—such as that it must avowedly bear the impress of a prediction of the future—that it must, in the most explicit terms, point to the person or times of Messiah—that it must be conveyed in language capable of no ambiguity, or double reference—and then, with this sharp weapon in our hand, proceed summarily to lop off all supposed prophetical passages in which these characteristics are wanting—holding such, if applied to Messianic times, to be mere accommodations originally intended for one thing, and afterwards loosely adapted to another. The rationalists of a former generation, were great adepts in this mode of handling prophetical Scripture, and by the use of it dexterously got over nearly one half of the passages which, in the New Testament, are represented as finding their fulfilment in Christ. But we have yet to learn that by so doing, they succeeded in throwing any satisfactory light on the interpretation of Scripture, or in placing on a Scriptural basis the connexion between the Old and the New in God's dispensations.

"How closely the principles of Mr. Lord lead him to tread in the footsteps of these effete interpreters, will appear presently. But we must first lodge our protest against his account of the essential nature and characteristics of a type, *as entirely arbitrary, and unsupported by Scripture.* The things really possessing this character, he maintains, must have had the following distinctive marks: They must have been specifically constituted types by God; must have been known to be so constituted, and contemplated as such by those who had to do with them; and must have been continued till the coming of Christ, when they were abrogated or superseded by something analogous in the Christian dispensation. These are his essential elements in the constitution of a type; and an assertion of the want of one or more of them forms the perpetual refrain, with which he disposes of those characters and transactions, that in his esteem are falsely accounted typical. *We demur to every one of them in the sense understood by our opponent, and challenge him, or any other person, to produce any Scriptural proof of them, as applying to the strictly religious symbols of the Old Testament worship and to them alone. They were not specifically constituted types, or formally set up in that character, no more than such transactions as the deliverance from Egypt or the preservation of Noah in the deluge, which are denied to have been typical.*

In the MANNER *of their appointment, viewed by itself, there is no more to indicate a reference to the Messianic* FUTURE *in the one than in the other. Neither were they for certain known to be types, and used as such by the Old Testament worshippers. They unquestionably were not in the time of our Lord; and how far they may have been at any previous period, is a matter only of doubtful speculation, but nowhere of express revelation. Nor finally, was it by any means an invariable and indispensable characteristic, that they should have continued in use, till they were superseded by something analogous in the Christian dispensation.*"—Vol. i. pp. 37–39.

He thus denies that these are characteristics even of the types of which we affirm them, and challenges us "to produce *any* scriptural proof of them as applying to the strictly religious symbols of the Old-Testament worship, and to them alone." How inconsiderate he is in this challenge, will soon appear. That the reader may see fully what the points are which we maintain, we re-state the definition—omitted by Dr. Fairbairn—we gave of the office of a type, and its distinguishing characteristics.

to the types, the worshipper was thus active, as in presenting the victim, and placing his hand on its head; in others he was a mere spectator, as of the slaughter and offering of the victim; and in others still, he was the object of agency, as when sprinkled with blood, or with water.

Types had the following characteristics:—1. They were not naturally types, or types by virtue of their constitution, but owed their office entirely to God's appointment.

2. They had no inherent virtue, but were mere substitutes for other things that are naturally efficacious.

3. They were known by the worshipper to be instituted by God; and it was the office of the priests generally to exert a portion of the acts that were enjoined respecting them, and to witness and direct those which the worshipper was to exert.

4. They were not prophetic. It was essential, in order to their use as types, that that for which they were substituted, or that of which they were the medium, should be known before, in order that they might be used in reference to it. If a sacrifice was made as a representative of a different sacrifice that was to be offered by the Messiah, that such a sacrifice was to be offered must have been known, in order that the representative sacrifice might be presented as a type of it. If the life of the victim was presented by the offerer as a substitute for his own, it must have been known that God had appointed it as such a substitute. If it was offered as a medium of obtaining forgiveness and favor, it must have been known that God had instituted it as a condition and medium of those benefits. Instead of being, therefore, like a vision, the means of a new revelation, they were only the means of manifesting or exemplifying truths, effects, or purposes, that had already been revealed.

5. They were of four great classes—agents who exerted typical acts, as the priests; objects of typical acts, as the victim, the offerer, the altar; typical acts, as slaying the victim, sprinkling the blood, burning the body; and effects, as atonement and cleansing.

6. They were employed on the principle of analogy, each one representing things of an order corresponding to itself; agents denoting agents, acts representing acts, and

effects standing for effects. Thus the sacrificial priests represented Christ in a corresponding sphere, as offering himself a sacrifice. The altar stood in place of the cross: the victim offered on the one was the representative of Christ crucified on the other. The blood of the victim represented Christ's blood; its effect on the worshipper for whom it was offered, the effect of Christ's blood on the believer; and the holy of holies, into which the high priest entered yearly, and presented the blood of the great sacrifice, typified the visible presence of God in heaven, where Christ ascended and presented his blood.

7. The types were superseded on the institution of the Christian system by the things which they typified, and have no place in the worship of the church.

8. They were all comprised in the tabernacle, its furniture, the priests, the various victims, and oblations, the acts exerted in the offerings, and their effects, or other parts of the Mosaic institute; and their whole sphere and use was in that worship, or the recognition, propitiation, and homage of God.

Such is the view we presented of the characteristics of types, and the office they fill; and it is of its leading elements, in reference to the tabernacle, the priests, the sacrifices, the ritual, and other institutes connected with them—that they were expressly appointed by God as types, that they were known to be types by the worshippers, and that they were superseded at the institution of the gospel,—that Dr. Fairbairn denies that we have any scriptural authority. No task, however, can be easier than the verification of those points to which he challenges us:

I. They were all expressly appointed by God. No one will have the rashness to dispute this. They are all specifically named in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and the most minute directions given in regard to their nature, their consecration, and the offices they were to fill. Thus the tabernacle and all its furniture were prescribed, and Moses was furnished with exact models after which they were to be formed. "Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for see (saith he) that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the Mount" (Heb. viii. 5; Exodus xxv.,

xxvi., xxvii.–xxxv., xxxviii.), where all the materials of which the tabernacle and its principal furniture were to be formed, and the shapes they were to receive, are designated. In other chapters equally explicit, commands were given in respect to the other utensils of the sanctuary, and the altars and courts. (Exodus xxx., xxxi., and other passages.) The priests also were designated by name, and solemnly inducted into their office, and detailed specifications given of their dress, and the modes in which they were to slay and offer the sacrifices, and perform the various services of the tabernacle. "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron," Heb. v. 4. See Exodus xxviii., xxix., xxxix., xl. The sacrifices and oblations, in like manner, were indicated with the greatest exactitude, the modes in which they were to be offered, and the disposition that was to be made of such of them, whether parts or wholes, as were not consumed on the altar. Lev. i.–xvi., and other passages. Thus all things pertaining to the tabernacle, the priests, the sacrifices, the offerings, and the sacred services, were expressly instituted by God, and owed to him the office they filled.

II. They were all also expressly appointed as types of other and higher things in the work of Christ, and the homage that is rendered to God through him under the present dispensation. Thus it is explicitly represented by Paul, that the tabernacle, its furniture, and its services were likenesses or representatives of heavenly things. "When Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people; saying,—This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry: and almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the likenesses [or representatives] of things in the heavens, should be purified with these [sprinklings], but the heavenly things with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands; the likenesses—[or counterparts] of the true; but into heaven itself, now to

appear in the presence of God for us," Heb. ix. 19–24. The holy places of the earthly tabernacle, that is the sanctuary and the holy of holies, are thus declared to be the likenesses, correspondents, or counterparts of the true holy places, namely—heaven itself,—the immediate presence of God. For the adjective αντίτυπα denotes that which resembles, corresponds, or presents a counterpart; and their correspondence or parallelism with the heavenly places, did not lie at all in their shape, size, the materials of which they were constructed, or anything of that nature, but solely in the resemblance which their office, as the scene in which the high priest exercised his functions, bore to the presence of God in heaven, in which Christ as priest presents his blood, and makes intercession for his people; and that is the correspondence of types to the things of which they are the substitutes and representatives.

But not only were the holy places—the sanctuary and holy of holies, types of the heavenly sanctuaries, but also all the objects that were sprinkled with blood, and the blood itself and the sprinkling, were types in like man-

the sprinkling, the blood, nor the sacrifices could have had any significance. In like manner, Heb. ix. 8–12, the tabernacle with its furniture and uses, is declared to be a parallel (that is symbol or type) for the time then present; according to which (character or office as a parallel), gifts and sacrifices were offered that had no power in respect to conscience to perfect him that served (consisting only of meats and drinks and divers washings—ordinances that respected the body)—until the time of rectification; and Christ appeared a high priest of the good things to come, through the better and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands—that is, not of this creation,—neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered once for all into the holy places, having obtained eternal redemption. No language could more clearly declare that the tabernacle and all that belonged to it was a mere counterpart and type of the heavenly sanctuary; and that the sacrifices offered at it, owed their whole significance to their pointing forward as types to Christ's sacrifice by which they were altogether superseded.

The priests and their service is in like manner exhibited as the mere shadow and counterpart of heavenly things. "We have such an [eternal] high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the holy places and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; whence it is necessary that this [high priest] have something which he might offer. If therefore he were on the earth, he would not be a priest; there already being those who offer the gifts according to law; who serve after the likeness and shadow of the heavenly things as Moses was commanded when about to finish the tabernacle. For, take heed, he says, that thou make all things according to the pattern which was shown thee in the Mount," Heb. viii. 1–5. The priests on earth are thus represented as presenting in their service in offering sacrifices and oblations, a likeness and shadow of the service of Christ in the heavenly place in the offering of the sacrifice he there presents: just as the tabernacle and its utensils were made by divine command according to a pattern that was shown to Moses on the Mount. Their whole function

was to set forth by an image the work of Christ, and the acts of worshippers toward him; precisely as the whole office of the tabernacle erected by the command of God, was to set forth by a type, the heavenly tabernacle in which Christ exercises his priestly functions.

We add another passage in which this is again affirmed of the whole ceremonial law. "For the law having [only] a shadow of the good things to come, not the image itself of the things, cannot with the same sacrifices which they offer continually year by year perfect those who draw near. For would they not have ceased being offered, on account of the worshippers having no longer any conscience of sins, being once purified?" Chap. x. 12.

The ceremonial law is thus declared not to have had the very substance and reality of the good things of Christ's expiation and priesthood; but only a shadow, that is a type and representative of them; and for that reason it is affirmed its sacrifices offered continually every year, no matter how numerous and imposing, had no efficacy to expiate those who presented them. They only pointed the offerers

have been the real and absolute ground of the forgiveness and acceptance that were conferred on the worshippers in connexion with them. Those who offered them in the manner and spirit enjoined by the law, were forgiven and accepted, as truly and unconditionally as believers in Christ now are by their faith in his blood. If the efficacy that attached to them was not the efficacy of his blood, it must have been their own; for the effusion of blood, we are told, was an indispensable condition of the remission of sins. But the blood of goats and calves, it is as expressly affirmed, cannot take away sin. The efficacy connected with them, therefore, was the efficacy of Christ's blood which they typified, and on which through them the faith of the offerers relied. And, finally, Dr. Fairbairn himself in effect admits and holds that the tabernacle and its furniture, the priests, the victims, the blood, and the whole ritual were typical of the heavenly tabernacle, Christ the high priest, his blood, and his ministry in heaven. For he not only expressly denominates them types, and explains them as filling that office, but he presents it as universally a characteristic of types; first that they are ordained by God as such, and next that they bear a resemblance to that which they typify. But what evidence has he that God constituted the tabernacle, its furniture, the altar, the priests, the victims, the blood, and the acts of the service, types of corresponding things in Christ's mediation, unless it be these and similar passages of the Old and New Testament? Not a particle. If he sets aside these and others that declare that God thus appointed them to their several offices, and that their offices were absolutely and exclusively typical, he has no proof that any types were ever instituted, and his whole scheme of typology sinks to a mere fiction of his fancy.

III. It is equally indisputable also that they were known to the worshippers as types.

1. It is apparent from these passages in which they are declared to be types. For they do not exhibit the ascription to them of that office as a novelty and a contradiction to the faith of the Hebrews. There is no intimation that Moses, the prophets, or any of the true people of God ever denied their typical character, and held that the victims they offered were the true and absolute ground of the forgiveness

and acceptance they sought and obtained in connexion with them.

2. Paul expressly affirms that the Holy Ghost, by their very nature and use, showed that those sacrifices were inefficacious, and only pointed the worshipper to the higher sacrifice of Christ which alone expiates sin. "The first covenant accordingly had ordinances of service and a worldly sanctuary. For the tabernacle was formed with the front in which were the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, which is called the sanctuary; and behind the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holy of holies, having the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant covered wholly with gold, in which were the golden pot having the manna, and Aaron's rod which budded, and the tables of the covenant, and above this ark the cherubims of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat, concerning which it is not now to speak particularly. And these being thus formed, into the front tent the priests continually entered performing the services; but into the second the high priest only once a year, not without blood, which he offers for himself and the errors of the people—*the Holy Ghost signifying this*—that the way of the holy places had not been manifested, while the first tabernacle has a standing, which tabernacle is a parallel [a type] for the time that is present, according to which [type] gifts and sacrifices [that are typical also] are offered, that cannot, in respect to conscience, make the worshipper perfect; consisting only of meats and drinks and divers washings—ordinances of the flesh—until the time of rectification, and Christ having appeared, a high priest of good things to come, through the better and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is not of this creation, nor by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, enters once for all into the holy places, having obtained eternal redemption," Heb. ix. 1–12. He thus expressly declares that by the daily entrance of the priests into the front sanctuary, and the high priest annually into the holy of holies with blood, the Holy Ghost showed, as long as the tabernacle continued, that the way into the holy places of heaven had not been manifested, inasmuch as that earthly tabernacle was a mere resemblance, or type, in which sacrifices that had no intrinsic efficacy were offered, till Christ

having come, should accomplish redemption by his own blood, and enter with it into the heavenly sanctuary. Heb. ix. 1–12. The Holy Ghost then, at the institution of these typical sanctuaries, sacrifices, and services, made it known by unfolding their meaning, that they were mere types of the higher things of heaven and Christ. That revelation of their representative nature, was made therefore to Moses and Aaron, and was undoubtedly transmitted from them to the whole body of priests that followed, and was an essential element in the faith of all true worshippers. For the knowledge of it was plainly indispensable, in order to an intelligent and acceptable performance of the tabernacle service. No victim could be offered, conformably to its nature and office, unless it was contemplated as a mere type of the higher sacrifice God was to provide for the expiation of sin.

It was expressly announced moreover in the psalms, that the sacrifices of the Mosaic ritual were not the means God had chosen for the expiation of sin, but that the Messiah was to become incarnate, that he might be our sacrifice. In Psalm xl. Christ himself announces his coming and assuming our nature for that purpose; the Holy Spirit thus interpreting his words by Paul. In proof that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins," he says: "Wherefore, when he—the Messiah—cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt offerings and offerings for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then, said I: Lo I come—in the volume of the book it is written of me—to do thy will, O God. Saying first, sacrifices and offerings, and whole burnt offerings, and offerings for sin, such as were offered according to the law, thou wouldst not, neither hast been pleased with; he then said: Behold I come to do thy will:—He takes away the first, that he may establish the second: by which will we are sanctified through the offering once for all of the body of Jesus Christ," Heb. x. 4–10; Psalm xl. 6–8. The Hebrews were thus expressly informed, and the announcement was incorporated in their temple chants, that God had never designed the victims of the altar as expiations for sin, but that Messiah himself in our nature was to be the victim whose blood was to make propitiation. As the holocausts and offerings for

sin, which God had enjoined in order to forgiveness, had no expiating virtue, it was manifest that they were mere types of the Messiah's sacrifice, and their office was to direct the worshippers to him, and be the means of expressing their faith in his blood.

The total inefficacy of the altar sacrifice was shown also by many of the prophets. Thus Solomon: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to theLord; but the prayer of the upright is his delight," Pro. xv. 8. Indicating that it was by the penitence, the faith, and the love of the offerer, that the sacrifice became acceptable, not the mere presentation of the victim. Isaiah, also, i. 11–13: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord? I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me." "He that killeth an ox, is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he

of forgiveness, assurance, and peace. The sin of which the Israelites were guilty, when offering them unacceptably, doubtless often was, that they disregarded their office as types of the great sacrifice Christ was to offer, and made no proper acknowledgments in them of their guilt; but treated them as tokens of homage, that were grateful to God, and the means on that account of securing his favor.

4. It was made known also that the Messiah was to be the great sacrifice by whose blood the sins of men were to be expiated. "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his month; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief. When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the labour of his soul and shall be satisfied. By the knowledge of him shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," Isaiah liii. 3–11.

It was thus openly and impressively made known to the Israelites that the Messiah was to be their sacrifice for sin; that he was to be rejected, scorned, and overwhelmed with humiliation and reproach for men, and bearing their iniquities was to be put to death as their sin-offering; and that his death was to be followed by an immortal life, in which he should carry into effect the aim of his sacrifice, and make it the ground of renewing and justifying them.

But it was revealed not only that he was to be the expiating victim that was to be offered for sin, but also with

equal explicitness, that he was to be the priest who was to offer that sacrifice, and that he was to exercise his priesthood for ever, and make intercession for his people, as well as make expiation for their sins. "Jehovah hath sworn and will not repent; Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek," Ps. cx. 5. "Therefore will I divide to him [exclusively] among the many, and he [alone] shall divide the spoil among the strong: because he poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered among the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors," Isaiah liii. 12. These distinct and emphatic announcements that the Messiah was the great High Priest who was to make atonement for sin; that he was himself to take the place of victim, bear the transgressions of men, and die as their sacrifice, and that he was thereafter to live for ever, make intercession for his people, and justify them by his blood, must have shown the Israelites, in the clearest manner, that the animal victims they were required to offer, had no expiating efficacy, but were mere representatives and harbingers of that mysterious victim, the promised seed of the covenant whose death it was thus revealed, was to be the ground of their forgiveness and acceptance. In the presence of this great doctrine, to suppose that the sacrifices of the Mosaic ritual accomplished the expiation of those who presented them, must have been impossible; for why then should it be necessary that the Messiah should become their victim, and that his blood should be the ground of their final justification with God? The appointment of him as their sacrifice and intercessor, and gift of pardon through him, bespake in the most decisive manner that the animal offerings on their altar had no other office than to typify the Messiah as the efficacious sacrifice, and be the means to the offerer of exercising and expressing faith in him.

The change of the priesthood itself showed that the sacrifices of the Mosaic ritual were wholly inefficacious; for if those sacrifices accomplished the expiation that was needed, why were not the priests who offered them in accordance with the prescriptions of the law, adequate to the office of presenting the victims and interceding for the people, and a priest of another order unnecessary? The apostle accord-

ingly asks: "If perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For the order of Aaron alone could be priests under the law. Yet it is foreshown that another priest arises, after the similitude of Melchisedek, who is made not after the law which contemplates the transmission of the office from one individual to another, as generation succeeds generation, but after the power of an endless life; for he testifies: Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek. For there was an abrogation of the preceding commandment—on account of its weakness and unprofitableness—(for the law perfected nothing)—and an introduction of a better hope by which we draw near to God," Heb. vii. 11–19. The prophecy of the Messiah's priesthood and sacrifice was a proclamation therefore, of the utter inadequacy of the Levitical priesthood and its sacrifices, and a prophecy of their abrogation, in order to the succession of that eternal priest whose blood is an absolute expiation, and through whom the believing have unobstructed access to God.

5. That the typical character of their sacrifices was made known to the Hebrews, is indubitable also from the fact that a knowledge that they were types of a higher victim, was necessary in order to their offering them according to their true character. They were made fully aware that if offered aright, expiation, forgiveness, and acceptance were connected with them. If then they had no intimation that they were not themselves expiatory, if they had no hint that they were representatives of a far higher sacrifice the Messiah was to accomplish, and means of directing the faith of the offerer to him, they could not have presented them in their true office, and exercised the faith in connexion with them that was essential to acceptance. They would necessarily have offered them in ignorance of their real nature, and probably would have made them the direct and absolute ground of their reliance for the blessings they sought through them. But it is incredible that God should, by such an omission to explain their nature and office, have placed the Israelites under an unavoidable necessity of mis-

judging the place they filled, and presenting them with views and expectations that were incompatible with their character and offensive to him.

But that he made Adam and Eve, and all that followed, acquainted with their nature as mere types, we know not only from his perfections, but from the fact that they offered them in a true faith, and became partakers of the blessings of which they were to be the medium. Thus it was by faith that Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain (who presented only a thank-offering) and it was more excellent, because it was a sacrifice for sin, in the presentation of which he, on the one hand, expressed his sense of his guilt, and on the other his faith in the great Redeemer whom the victim typified; and so of Enoch who prophesied of the Messiah; Abraham, who saw his day afar off and was glad; David, to whom he was promised as the inheritor of his throne; and all the prophets and believers to the time of Christ's coming, who though borne witness to in respect to their faith, did not receive the promise, God having provided the better things for us under the gospel, so that they could not apart—that is by a different method—from us be made perfect. Heb. xi. 39, 40.

6. And finally, Dr. Fairbairn himself must, to be consistent, admit that these types were by those means known to the Israelites. For he admits that they were types, while he denies that they were expressly instituted as such, or their typical character made known. But how can he prove that they were types, unless by the passages we have cited in which the history is given of their appointment, their office explained, and they are directly declared to be without any intrinsic efficacy, and to be types and shadows of heavenly things, and to point to the sanctuary in heaven, and the priesthood, and sacrifice of Christ? He cannot. If these are not proofs that they were instituted as types, there are none in the sacred word, and his whole system falls to the ground.

IV. They were superseded at Christ's death and ascension;—the tabernacle and temple, by the heavenly tabernacle, the sacrifices by Christ's sacrifice, the Levitical priesthood by his which is unchangeable and eternal. Heb. vii.

We have thus the most ample authority for the several

points we maintained, that these types of the Mosaic ritual were expressly appointed as such, that their typical character was made known to the Israelites, and that they were superseded on the introduction of the Christian system. We were accordingly justified in treating these characteristics as essential criteria of types, and holding that no persons, objects, acts, or events, have any title to be considered such, that want them. That Dr. F. should have had the rashness to deny it so peremptorily, and challenge us to produce any scriptural proof of it, excites astonishment.

As these characteristics belong indisputably to all the types of the Mosaic ritual, in order to demonstrate that besides these, a vast body of other personages, appointments, acts, and events of the Old Testament also fill that office, Dr. Fairbairn should prove either that these characteristics were not essential to constitute the tabernacle, priests, and sacrifices of the Mosaic ritual types; or else that though indubitable criteria of types of those classes, there are other orders to which they do not belong, and to which they are not requisite. But he offers no such proof, nor can he. How can he prove that the express institution of animal sacrifices, as types of Christ's sacrifice, was not essential to their being such? The supposition is solecistical. They could be types of Christ's sacrifice only as they were constituted such. To be enjoined without any aim or office whatever, would not be to be constituted representatives and counterparts of Christ as the expiating victim for sin. To be enjoined for a wholly different purpose, would not be to be constituted types of him. They could fill that office, only as they were specially instituted to fill it. How can he prove that it could be known by the priests and the offerers that they were types of the higher sacrifice of Christ, unless it were made known to them by the Most High that that was their office? He cannot. It could only be by a revelation that it could be known that God was to give a Redeemer, and that he alone was to make an expiation for sin. It could be by revelation alone, that it could be known whether these sacrifices bore any relation to him; and if related to him, what that relation was.

As, then, Dr. Fairbairn cannot show that these characteristics were not essential to constitute these types what they

were, and make it possible that they should fill their office; he cannot prove that they are not characteristics universally of types, unless he can point to another class of persons, objects, acts, or events to which they do not belong, and that yet are indubitably exhibited in the word of God as filling that office. But he has not demonstrated the existence of any other order of types, nor can he. So far from it, his own definition of a type, though meant to comprehend all the persons, objects, and events to which he gives the title, in fact admits none that have not the characteristics we have enumerated. He says,

"We shall not attempt what we have already found to prove so fruitless in the hands of another, to begin with *a precise definition of a type.* The points that would require to be embraced by it *are of too complex and varied a character* to admit of being distinctly expressed in a brief enunciation. But there are two principal ideas more or less clearly indicated in the definitions commonly adopted, which unfold what is of primary moment, and comprise all that is necessary as a foundation for further inquiry. Understanding the word *type* in a theological sense, or *with respect to the relations between Old and New Testament things*—for the word itself is undoubtedly used with greater latitude—it is admitted by general consent, that in the character, action, or institution, which is denominated the type, there must be *a resemblance in form or spirit* to what answers to it under the gospel. And, secondly, that it must not be *any* character, action, or institution occurring in Old Testament Scripture, *but such only as had their ordination of God, and were designed* by him to foreshadow and prepare for the better things of the gospel. For as Bishop Marsh has justly remarked, 'to constitute one thing the type of another, something more is wanted than mere resemblance. The type as well as the antitype must have been *preordained;* and they must have been preordained as constituent parts of the same general scheme of divine providence. It is this *previous design*, and this *preordained* connexion [together of course with the resemblance] which constitutes the relation of type and antitype.' We insert —*together with the resemblance;*—for while stress is justly laid on the previous design and preordained connexion, the resemblance also forms an indispensable element in this very connexion, and is in fact the point that involves the more peculiar

difficulties belonging to the subject, and calls for the closest investigation."—Vol. i. pp. 46, 47.

Though he thus endeavored to give his definition as wide a scope as possible, he yet admits that types are not such by virtue of their mere nature, nor of their resemblance to that which they typify, but solely by their being constituted such by God's express ordination. And as that ordination cannot have been by the mere structure of their nature, which is the ground of their resemblance and adaptation to fill the office of types; for that would imply that they were made types by their nature—it must have been by an express legislative act of God, and a knowledge of that act must have been communicated to the Hebrews. For how could it be known that they were constituted types in that manner if no notice was given of the ordaining act? By Dr. Fairbairn's own definition, therefore, an express and public appointment and record of it in the Old Testament, was essential to the institution of a type. He must accordingly, to verify his theory, produce such an ordaining act for every person and thing to which he assigns the office of type. But the whole of his vast catalogue is excluded by this test from the sphere of types, except the tabernacle, its furniture, the priests, the sacrifices, and the acts of the ritual services. For there is no record in the Old Testament of the institution of any except those of the tabernacle and the priests, the victims and the ritual service. Dr. Fairbairn alleges none. He does not attempt it. On the ground of his own definition, therefore, his theory of the typology of the historical persons, occurrences, and acts of the Old Testament generally, wholly fails. It is as impossible to sustain it on his definition of a type as it is on ours.

He aims, however, to supply this want of specific legislative or ordaining acts by the representation that it entered as an element into the genius of the Old Testament economy, that its personages, special providences, and acts generally, should be typical of analogous things in the gospel dispensation. Thus, he says, in regard to "the previous design and preordained connexion necessarily entering into the relation between type and antitype:"

"A relation so formed and subsisting to any extent between

Old and New Testament things, evidently presupposes and implies two important *facts*. It implies first that the realities of the gospel which constitute the antitypes, are the ultimate objects which were contemplated by the mind of God, when planning the economy of his successive dispensations."—Vol. i. p. 47.

But what is meant by the economy of the Mosaic dispensation? Did it consist of anything besides its laws, and the institutes created by them? Did it include the land of Egypt, its river, its monarch, its people? Did it include the Red Sea, the wilderness of Sinai, the Amalekites, the Moabites, the Jordan, Jericho, Ai, and the other cities of Canaan, their population, and the battles in which they were conquered? Were the Philistines, the Assyrians, the Egyptians of the age of Rehoboam, the Babylonians, the Greeks, the Romans, a part of the Mosaic economy? If not, if nothing belonged to that dispensation but its positive institutes, how does it follow from the fact that though God, in planning that dispensation, formed some things with a typical reference to the realities of the gospel, the things so formed were not confined to the tabernacle, the priests, the sacrifices, the ritual, that were expressly ordained, but embraced many others? How is that conclusion connected with the premise? A very unsatisfactory method truly of establishing his point, to infer that because God has specifically constituted a certain system of types of the heavenly sanctuary, Christ and his sacrifice, therefore, a vast crowd of other places, persons, and occurrences mentioned in the Old Testament, were also types of the realities of the gospel, although we have no intimation of their being formally constituted such. He proceeds,

"And it implies, secondly, that to prepare the way for the introduction of these ultimate objects, he placed the church under a course of training, which included instruction by types, *or designed and fitting resemblances of what was to come.* Both of these facts are so distinctly stated in Scripture, and, indeed, so generally admitted, that it will be unnecessary to do more than present a brief outline of the proof on which they rest."—P. 47.

But how does the fact that God "placed the church

under a course of training which included instruction by types," prove that those types, instead of being confined to the tabernacle and the sacrificial ritual, which are expressly designated and defined as such, embraced multitudes of others of wholly different natures and spheres, that are nowhere exhibited as filling that office? Can anything be more obvious than that he begs the point he attempts to establish? To argue that because God appointed certain persons and things as types, and gave an express notification that that was their office; that therefore thousands and tens of thousands of other persons and things that received no such appointment, and stand in no such relation, were also types, is surely very poor logic. On that principle, Dr. Fairbairn may prove, that inasmuch as one tribe of the Israelitish people was consecrated to the service of the sanctuary, and other religious ministries, therefore all the other tribes also were consecrated to the same offices; and that, inasmuch as one family of the tribe of Levi were constituted priests, therefore all the other families of that tribe were; and that, inasmuch as one of the priests of that family was invested with the office of high priest, therefore all the others were. He adds:

"The other fact presupposed and implied in the relation between type and antitype—namely, that God subjected the church to a course of preparatory training, including instruction by types, before he introduced the realities of his final dispensation—is written with equal distinctness in the page of inspiration. It is scarcely possible, indeed, *to dissociate, even in idea*, the one fact from the other; for without such a course of preparation being perpetually in progress, the long delay which took place in the introduction of the Messiah's kingdom would be quite inexplicable. Accordingly, the church of the Old Testament is constantly represented as having been in a state of comparative childhood, supplied only with such means of instruction, and subjected to such methods of discipline as were suited to so imperfect and provisional a period of her being. Her law, as its higher aim and object, was a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, and *everything in her condition* —what it wanted, as well as what it possessed—what was done for her, and what remained to be done—concurred in pointing the way to Him, who was to come with the better promises,

and the perfected salvation. Such is the plain import of a great many Scriptures bearing on the subject."—Vol. i., pp. 48, 49.

This is but a repetition of the paralogism of the preceding passages. Because certain things were constituted types, does it follow that everything else was? Because certain species of animals were appointed to be sacrificial types of Christ, does it follow that all other animals were designated to that office? Because certain animals were precluded from use as sacrifices and as food, does it follow that all others were? If not, how does Dr. Fairbairn's argument hold? Were the things prohibited in the Ten Commandments typical;—idol-worship, profaning God's name, murder, violation of the marriage covenant, of the rights of property, of the truth in testimony? If so, what were they typical of? If obliged to confess that there are exceptions to the list of types; if unclean animals were; if all tents were, except the tabernacle; if all clean animals were, that were slaughtered for other purposes than sacrifice; if all garments except the official garments of the priests; if all tables, lamps, veils, lavers, except those of the sanctuary, were;—how can Dr. Fairbairn prove that everything else may not, with the exception of those connected with the tabernacle worship, which are expressly designated as such? He certainly does not. He as certainly cannot. His argument from the nature and aim of the dispensation is a mere assumption of what he affects to prove; and is so false in its principle that it may be used to overthrow his typology as effectively as, if true, it would sustain it. For if the fact that some things that belonged to the Mosaic dispensation were types, proves that all that belonged to, or stood connected with it were, then the equally indisputable fact, that some things that belonged to that dispensation were *not* types, will prove with a like certainty that none of them were.

Dr. Fairbairn thus fails wholly to show, from the nature and aims of the dispensation, that there were any types in it, except those that were expressly instituted and announced as such. He has not furnished any authority for the reference of a single person, object, act, or event to that class, besides those explicitly recognised as such in the Scriptures

—the tabernacle, the priests, the sacrifices, and the implements and acts of the sacrificial ritual.

His scheme, thus, testing it by his own criteria, wholly fails. He was bound by his own definition of a type to prove by explicit testimonies from the Scriptures, that those to which he gives the name, that did not belong to the tabernacle, the priests, the sacrifices, and the ritual, were yet expressly ordained to the office. Yet he alleges no such testimonies. He only begs what he affects to demonstrate, and on a principle that, if turned, as it may be, against him, will prove naturally that there were not as many types as he imagines, but that there were none whatever.

We ask Dr. Fairbairn's reconsideration of this point. It is vain for him to attempt to sustain his theory, as long as it is thus irreconcilable with his own definition, though that is attenuated to the greatest possible vagueness, in order to embrace what it after all precludes. Let him show that the whole of that large class of persons and things which he calls types—were *ordained* such. If he cannot by the most specific testimonies, he must either give up his system, or else must erase the ordination of types by God from his definition, and make their resemblance to that which they are held to represent, the only ground of their office; and thence make all things, whatever their nature or character may be, types of all other things to which they present any resemblance. He not only thus fails to establish the ordination of the numerous persons, acts, and events disconnected with the religious rites of the Mosaic institute, to which he assigns the office of types, but he is unable to show that there are any that are entitled to that name, except those that fall within our definition.

The first to which he endeavors to give the charcter of a type, is the paschal feast. But he seems to overlook the distinction between the paschal lamb, and the commemorative feast in which that lamb was eaten. The paschal lamb as a sacrifice belongs to the general class of sacrifices, enumerated by us as representatives of Christ as a sacrifice, and expressly appointed to that office by God. In treating that lamb as a sacrifice, Dr. Fairbairn does not add to those embraced in our definition. But the fact that the lamb was

a sacrifice, does not imply that the commemorative feast, in which it was eaten, was also a type of some analogous feast in the Christian dispensation. For a large share of the sacrificial victims offered at the tabernacle, were also eaten by the priests, yet their eating them was not typical of the eating of the Lord's supper, nor of the eating by the ministers of the Christian church of analogous offerings to God by Christian worshippers.

The paschal feast cannot have been typical of a feast in the Christian church—because its express function was to commemorate a past event;—an office that precluded its having a like reference to the future. How could the partakers of that feast, when expressly commanded to eat it, as a memorial of the deliverance of the first-born of Israel from the destruction that fell on the first-born of the Egyptians, also eat it as a type of a future feast by Jews and Gentiles, of which they had no knowledge or expectation?

It could not be a type of the Lord's supper; because the nature of the event it commemorated was wholly different from that of which the Lord's supper is a memorial. The passover feast was a commemoration of the deliverance of the first-born of the Israelites from the angel of death, that entered the dwellings of the Egyptians. The Lord's supper is in commemoration of Christ's death itself as our sacrifice, not of our deliverance from death through him. That is not yet fully accomplished. There is not the analogy therefore between them that is essential to the relation of a type to an antitype.

He endeavors, however, to verify his view of it by a reference to Luke xxii. 15, 16.

"To say nothing of other passages of Scripture, which bear less explicitly, though to our mind very materially upon the subject, our Lord himself, at the celebration of the last passover, declared to his disciples, 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God? That is (for what else can the words mean?) There is a prophecy as well as a memorial in this commemorative ordinance,—a prophecy because it is the rehearsal of a typical transaction, which is now and only now to meet with its

full realization. Such appears to be the plain and unsophisticated import of our Lord's words."—P. 39.

But he here gratuitously assumes, and against the indubitable sense of the words, the point he should prove. The verb translated fulfilled, cannot mean accomplished as a prophecy: as the passover feast was not a prophecy, but a commemoration of what was past. To say that the feast was accomplished, would be simply to say that it had taken place, or had been celebrated, according to the divine command instituting and enjoining its annual observance. In place of that, the sense of the verb here is, finished, brought to an end; and the meaning of the declaration is simply, that he would eat the passover feast no more, inasmuch as the sacrifice of the passover, like the other sacrifices of the Mosaic institute, was then to be discontinued, because superseded by his own sacrifice. The sacrifice being abrogated, the commemorative feast of the deliverance of Israel's first-born from the angel of death, was of necessity abolished with it. The feast itself accordingly was not a prophecy of the institution of a different feast in the Christian church, any more than the Lord's supper which is to be discontinued at Christ's second coming, is a prophecy and type of some other feast that is to be instituted after it. He alleges also, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, as confirming his views, but by an extraordinary misconception of the passage.

"And the apostle Paul is, if possible, still more explicit. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. 'Therefore let us keep the feast,' etc. What, we again ask, are we to understand by these words, if not that there is in the design and appointment of God an ordained connexion between the sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the passover, so that the one, as the means of redemption, takes the place of the other? In any other sense, the language would be only fitted to mislead, by begetting apprehensions regarding a mutual correspondence and connexion, which had no existence."—P. 40.

He here again confounds the paschal lamb as a sacrifice, with the commemorative feast in which that lamb was eaten. The fact that the lamb was slain as a sacrifice, and in that relation was like other sacrifices a type of Christ, does not

prove that the eating of the lamb in commemoration of the deliverance of the first-born of Israel from the angel of death, was typical of the Lord's supper, in which his death—an event of a wholly different nature—is celebrated. How can Dr. Fairbairn persuade himself that the commemoration of *the continuance* of the lives of the first-born of Israel, can be a type of *the taking away* of the life of the Redeemer of the world? Can anything be plainer than that they are opposites instead of analogues?

But he wholly mistakes the import of the passage. There is not the remotest allusion in it to the Lord's supper. The apostle was rebuking the Corinthians for assuming that their character as a church was so elevated, and so well established, that it would not detract from their reputation to allow the incestuous person to continue his revolting sin without excommunication or rebuke. "Ye are puffed up, with self-estimation and disdain of vindicating yourselves from the charge of sanctioning his sin, instead of being so grieved and roused to a sense of your duty as to remove him from among you. Your boasting of your high character is not good. Know ye not, that a little leaven leavens the whole lump?" That is, know ye not that as leaven introduced into a mass of dough immediately spreads its influence to all its particles and makes itself an element of its nature; so, if the sin of the incestuous person is allowed to pass unrebuked, the church virtually sanctions it, and thereby sinks itself in principle to a level with him, and will thence naturally lead others to imitate his example? Here the action of leaven in dough is used to exemplify the effect on the church of gross sin in one of its members that is countenanced and allowed to exert itself on the other members, without discipline or rebuke. Then, on the ground of that parallel influence he employs the duty under the Old Testament of removing from their dwellings all leaven at the sacrifice of the passover, to enforce the like duty in the Christian church of freeing themselves from all gross offences and offenders. "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened." He thus first, by a metaphor, calls them a lump of dough, and then virtually denominating the revolting sin of which one of their number was guilty, "old leaven," commands them

to remove the old leaven from among them, that they might be, according to their profession and vows, as Christ's disciples, free from the gross and scandalous sin, which he employed the leaven to represent. He next, in a metaphor, denominates Christ our passover, and affirms that he is slain, and continuing the use of leaven—by a hypocatastasis as a representative of gross sin,—as though there were to be a passover feast, exhorts that it be kept (not with the old leaven, nor the leaven of malignity and wickedness), but with the unleavenedness of purity and truth. Christ is thus, too plainly to admit of debate, by a metaphor, called our passover, and gross sin denominated leaven, for the mere sake of exemplifying in an impressive form the duty of expelling from the church the offender who defiled and endangered it. The necessity so imperatively enforced under the Mosaic institute of excluding all leaven from the passover feast, is used by substitution, to exemplify and enforce the equally indispensable duty of expelling from the church the scandalous offender an doffence by which its laws had been violated, and its character dishonored. The supposition that the exhortation is unfigurative, and relates to literal leaven and a literal feast, makes nonsense of the passage and of the apostle's argument. Not the remotest reference exists in it to the Lord's supper.

Dr. Fairbairn, however, unfortunately fails to see this, and exhibits the apostle as having wholly forgot the crime in respect to which he was rebuking the Corinthians, and employing himself in showing that leaven ought not to be used in the bread of the Lord's table! The exposition we give in which we unfold the passage according to the laws of its figures, he calls a "sort of trifling with the testimony of Scripture," which characterizes most of our objections to "the instances" he alleges to sustain his theory; and so unsophisticated is his innocence, that he appears not to have suspected that there is anything "harsh and contemptuous" in such a denunciation of criticisms which he is unable to answer.

He is equally dissatisfied with our construction of Galatians iv. 21–31. He says:—

"Our reviewer furnishes us still further with a specimen of his dialectical skill, in the remarks he makes on the passage in

Galatians respecting Sarah and Isaac on the one side, and Hagar and Ishmael on the other. He begins as usual with telling us that there is nothing typical expressed in the characters and relations there mentioned, for they are not any of them called types; nor we may add, if they had been, would it have brought us a whit nearer the mark. 'It is only said,' he continues, 'that that which is related of Hagar and Sarah is exhibited allegorically; that is, that there are other things that, used as allegorical representatives, or parallels, of Hagar and Sarah, exhibit the same facts and truths.' The object of the allegory is to exemplify them—that is, that which they present—by analogous things; not *by* them—that is what they present—to exemplify something else."—Vol. i. pp. 41, 42.

This Dr. F. denies, and in a tone of contemptuousness which a very slight comprehension of the passage would have repressed. The *form* of the allegory is indisputably that which we represented. The apostle introduces it by asking, "Tell me, ye who desire to be under the law, why do ye not hear the law?" This indicates that what he is about to say is designed to exemplify the law, that is, the doctrine of the Pentateuch. What now is the method he takes to give that exemplification? He begins by stating a case from the Pentateuch in regard to the nature and truth of which all were agreed. "For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one of the bond maid, and one of the free woman. But he who was of the bond woman was born according to the flesh [in a natural way]; he, however, who was of the free woman, according to the promise [that is, supernaturally]. Which are allegorized." Now the meaning of this last expression, which is in the passive voice, is, which are exemplified or paralleled by something else, just as in the allegory of Isaiah v. 1–7, it is the house of Israel that is allegorized by the vineyard, not the vineyard that is allegorized by the house of Israel. Whether it suits Dr. Fairbairn or not, the fact is indisputable that it is the two women and their sons which Paul declares have a parallel in something else; not something else that has a parallel in the two women and their sons. What are they then that present that parallel? The apostle answers: They are the two covenants. "The one from Mount Sinai genders into bondage, which is Hagar, for the Hagar [a

mount] is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answers to the present Jerusalem; for she serves as a slave with her children." Here the covenant from Sinai is exhibited as presenting a parallel to Hagar in three respects: first, that it genders into bondage; next, that the mountain from which it was proclaimed is called in Arabic, Hagar; and thirdly, that Jerusalem from which the law continued to be proclaimed by the priests and rulers at the time Paul wrote, was in servitude with her children. There is no room therefore for a denial that it is the covenant from Sinai that is here exhibited as presenting a parallel to Hagar and her son; not Hagar and her son that are exhibited as presenting a parallel to that covenant.

He now proceeds to state the parallel which the gospel covenant presents to Sarah and her son: "But the [covenant] of the heavenly Jerusalem is free [answers to the free woman] who is the mother of us all." Here also the gospel covenant is expressly exhibited as presenting a parallel to Sarah. He accordingly proceeds to prove it. "Rejoice thou barren, that bearest not. Break forth and cry thou who art not in birth-pangs; for many are the children of the desolate rather than of her who has a husband; and we brethren are like Isaac, children of promise. But as then, he who was born according to the flesh persecuted him who was born according to the Spirit, so also now. But what says the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman, and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not inherit with the son of the free. Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." The covenant of the gospel is thus exhibited as presenting a parallel to Sarah in four respects. First, in the multitude of offspring or subjects. They are to be like her descendants (Genesis xvii. 16), innumerable. Next, They are children of Promise. Third, They are persecuted by the unrenewed. Fourth, They alone are heirs of the eternal inheritance. Thus clear is it, as we alleged, that it is the covenants that are exhibited in this allegory as presenting parallels to Hagar and Sarah; not Hagar and Sarah as parallels to the covenants.

They present, therefore, not the remotest ground for Dr. Fairbairn's allegation, that Hagar and Sarah are types of the covenants. He is precluded from it by his admission

that that which is allegorical cannot be regarded as typical. "If the typology of Scripture cannot be rescued from the domain of allegorizings, it will be impossible to secure for it a solid and permanent footing," vol. i. p. 86. He is precluded from it by the purpose for which the apostle employs them. It is simply that he may show that the covenants are to those who live under them, what Hagar and Sarah were to their offspring. It can no more be held that Hagar and Sarah were types of the covenants, than it can that anything else is a type of that which is exhibited as resembling it. Because the spouse is declared to be beautiful as Tirzah and comely as Jerusalem (Song of Songs vi. 4), are Tirzah and Jerusalem to be regarded as types of the spouse? Because the bridegroom's cheeks are represented to be as a bed of spices, as sweet flowers, his lips as lilies dropping myrrh, and his countenance as Lebanon; are a bed of spices and sweet flowers to be taken as types of his cheeks, lilies of his lips, and Lebanon of his countenance? They are on the principle on which Dr. Fairbairn proceeds, that that in a person or event which has a parallel

the work, a good deal of Scriptural authority, besides this, bearing on the subject."—Vol. i. p. 44.

He here insinuates that we treated the passage quoted from Hosea as the only one he professed to regard as indicating that Israel was a type of Christ. Not a shadow of ground, however, has he for such a representation. It is as gratuitous and as wide from the fact, as the charge would have been, had he alleged that we represent this as the only instance in which he claims that an historical event was a prophecy and a type.

"It was, however, referred to as one of the passages most commonly employed by typological writers in proof of such a relationship, and in itself most obviously implying it. But what says our reviewer? 'The language of Matthew does not imply that it (the passage in Hosea), was a prophecy of Christ: he simply states that Jesus continued in Egypt till Herod's death, so that that occurred in respect to him, which had been spoken by Jehovah by the prophet, Out of Egypt have I called my Son: or in other words, so that that was accomplished in respect to Christ, which had been related by the prophet of Israel. Had we not good *reason for saying that our author's principles* INEVITABLY *led him, as an interpreter of Scripture, to tread in the footsteps of the rationalists?* One might suppose that it was a comment of Paulus or Kiunoel, that we were here presented with, and we transfer their paraphrase and notes to the bottom of the page, to show how entirely they agree in spirit. If the evangelist simply meant what is ascribed to him, was he so unskilled in the ordinary use of language as not to be able plainly to express it? Or if the words he employed distinctly indicate such a connexion between Christ and Israel as gave to the testimony in Hosea the force of a prophecy (which must be the impression of every unbiassed reader), what shall we say of the arbitrary and sophistical sense, which the reviewer thinks himself entitled to put even on the words of inspiration? And this too, from one who hardly knows how to express his astonishment that such a work as the Typology should have appeared, at a period when the principles of language are more thoroughly investigated than in any former age, and the whole body of the learned hold, that the sacred volume, like other writings, is to be interpreted by the laws of philology!' Surely there was never more need for the application of the maxim, 'Physician, heal thyself.'"—Vol. i. pp. 44, 45.

He thus openly charges that our principles are rationalistic, and denounces our construction of this passage as "arbitrary, sophistical," and false. These are certainly very grave imputations, and should not have been uttered, unless susceptive of the most ample demonstration. Unless based on evidence, they are audacious and malignant misrepresentations. How happens it, then, if Dr. Fairbairn had any proof of their truth, that he did not present it, and verify his charges? Not a word does he utter to sustain them. Not a syllable even to show that our translation or construction of the language is not legitimate. Can any creditable reason for this silence be conjectured? It is a sad indication, when a writer on such a theme deems unjustifiable accusations a better expedient for the defence of himself than truth.

The pretence that the construction we placed on the passage is not grammatically correct, and consistent with the scriptural and classical usage of the terms, is groundless and absurd. "And he arose, and took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἕως τῆς

him which God had said of Israel. And that it is often ecbatic no one denies. That it is ecbatic, also, in a very considerable number of passages in the New Testament, and among others this, Dr. Fairbairn must be aware is no peculiar opinion of ours, but is the judgment of many of the ablest scholars. Has he never seen Bretschneider, Tittman, Winer, Robinson, Olshausen, and a crowd of others who assign it that office? But that it has that sense in this passage, is indisputable from the fact, that the saying to be accomplished by the recall of Jesus from Egypt was an historical statement, not a prophecy of a future event. That its form is historical, no one will deny, nor will any dispute that the event it relates was a past event. And that being the fact, the sense of ἵνα must be ecbatic, or simply, *so that* the saying of the prophet could become applicable to Jesus; inasmuch as the sense of *in order that*, cannot be admitted, except on the supposition that the language is prophetic, instead of historical. The fancy that it is both, is self-contradictions. But it is wholly unjustifiable to assume, without any philological reason and against its indubitable nature, that it is prophetic, in order to maintain Dr. Fairbairn's theory of types. The structure itself of the passage thus demonstrates that the meaning of ἵνα is simply that a recall of Jesus from Egypt might take place in such a manner that it might be described in the language in which the prophet, many ages before, had related the call of Israel from Egypt.

Third. That the verb πληρωθῇ is often used in the sense of accomplished, performed, done, and may here justly receive the rendering we have given it, is equally indisputable. It means literally in the active voice, to fill; in the passive, to be filled, as a vessel with a fluid. When applied therefore to a promise, prophecy, or event, it cannot mean literally to fill the promise, word, or event, as that which was empty is filled with some form of matter—but only to fill it metaphorically;—that is, by the accomplishment of the promise or word, by the occurrence of the event. And that is precisely the sense we assign it here. The verb is in the subjunctive passive, and denotes literally the *possibility* of the event in respect to Jesus, which the prophet had related in regard to Israel. Ἵνα πληρωθῇ, so that that might be done (in respect to Jesus) which was spoken by the Lord through

the prophet [in regard to Israel], "Out of Egypt I have called my son;" that is, the flight of the parents with the child to Egypt, and their remaining there till the death of Herod, prepared the way for God's calling the child from Egypt, as he had formerly called Israel from it. The evangelist, it should be noticed—does not say that God had called him from Egypt: he only says, that in consequence of the child's being carried and retained there for a time, God *could* call him as he had called Israel out of Egypt. The evangelist thus in the use of the subjunctive passive, treats the language he quotes from Hosea, as historical, not prophetic, and accordingly the actual calling of the child from Egypt took place, Matthew narrates, later, after Herod's death. "And Herod having died, behold the angel of the Lord appeared in a dream, to Joseph in Egypt, saying, Arise and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel; for they have died who sought the child's life." That which he before represented as simply possible, he now represents as become a fact.

Fourth. But why should Matthew quote the words of Hosea, if they were not prophetic? What could render the reference natural and proper, unless Israel, in being called from Egypt, was a type of Christ? It was his aim, doubtless, simply to point to the extraordinary parallelisms that subsisted between them. That Christ was borne to Egypt immediately after his birth, in order to his being preserved from death by the hand of Herod; as Jacob and his family, seventeen hundred years before, had been obliged to go there, to escape death by famine: and that Christ, after remaining there for a time, was to be recalled to Judea, in order to accomplish the work for which he came into the world; as the Israelites, after dwelling there for two centuries, were recalled to Canaan, that they might inherit the land, and fill the sphere that was assigned them as God's people; were impressive coincidences, and exemplified in a touching manner the humiliation to which the Redeemer of the world was subjected, and the strength and deadliness of the enmity of men he from the first encountered. And it was doubtless to bring to the view of his readers that great feature of the reception the Saviour met in the world he came to ransom; and remind them of the

miracles that were requisite to preserve him from destruction, that the evangelist referred to the language of the prophet.

Such are the resistless proofs that ours is the true and the only just construction of the passage. It gives the exact sense of the words, and a sense that is perfectly natural and suited to the occasion; it involves no forced assumption that, like Dr. Fairbairn's, turning history into prophecy, subverts the laws of language; it relieves the passage from the objection urged with vehemence by rationalists and infidels, that its treatment by Matthew as a prophecy, when it is in fact a history, proves that he cannot have been inspired.

After this vindication of ourselves, it is not necessary that we should descend to a formal confutation of Dr. F.'s charges of rationalism. We leave our readers to judge what estimate must be formed of one who, utterly mistaken in his theory, and unable to meet the objections that are urged against it, resorts to false and opprobrious accusations of his opponent, to excite prejudice against him, and diminish the force of his criticisms.

Dr. Fairbairn thus wholly fails to verify his system. The proofs of its erroneousness become clearer and more numerous the more thoroughly it is tested; and he has no safe way but to abandon it, and confine his Typology to the sphere of the Mosaic ritual, and place all other resemblances that are suitable to be noticed in a volume by themselves, under the title of Historical Analogies. Thus modified, and corrected of subordinate errors, his work may take a far higher rank than it has hitherto reached, and render an important service to the church.

Art. II.—God is Love.

BY THE REV. ENOCH POND, D.D.

That "God is love" is expressly asserted in the Scriptures. See 1 John iv. 8. After such an announcement, to attempt to prove the proposition would be more than super-

fluous. It would be a virtual impeachment of the truth and sufficiency of Scripture. It would be as much as to say, that a positive declaration of God's word was unworthy of credence unless supported by other evidence.

But although the proposition before us requires no proof, it may require *explanation;* and my principal object in this paper will be to explain it, and to show its consistency with other leading facts and doctrines of the Bible.

"God is love." The love here spoken of is primarily that of *benevolence;*—a wishing well to the universe of being; an earnest preferring and seeking of the highest universal good. This love of benevolence enters into and constitutes the root, the element of all holiness. The law of God, in the most summary expression of it, requires nothing else. "Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself." This love is represented in the Scriptures as "the bond of perfectness," the "fulfilling of the law;" and as that on which "hang all the law and the prophets." In the proposition before us, it is made to comprise the whole of the divine character. *God is love.* Every thing of a moral nature in the heart of God—all his moral exercises and affections—are summed up in holy, disinterested love.

But love always has an *object.* To suppose the affection of love to exist without an object—love in actual exercise, where there is nothing loved—is an absurdity. What then are the objects of divine love? In other words what does God love? And in what measure and manner is his love exercised?

First of all, God *loves himself as he deserves;* and that is with a *supreme affection.* He has a supreme regard, as he ought to have, for his own glory. For any other being in the universe to love himself supremely, would be to love himself out of all proportion. It would be selfishness. But it is no selfishness in God to love himself supremely; because he is really, intrinsically worthy of supreme affection. His honor and interests are more to be regarded than those of any, or of all other beings. If his love is disinterested and impartial; if he loves every being—and himself among the rest—according to its intrinsic merits and worthiness, then he must love himself supremely. Accordingly

the Scriptures represent him as having a supreme regard for himself; as being himself *the end* of all his works. "The Lord hath made all things *for himself*," Prov. xvi. 4. "For *thy pleasure* they are, and they were created," Rev. iv. 11. "*For whom* are all things, and by whom are all things," Heb. ii. 10.

In the second place, God loves *all his creatures impartially*, each according to its own fitness or worthiness, considered as a part of the infinite whole. God loves *the blest inhabitants of heaven*, not beyond what is fit and right, but precisely according to what is fit and right; not enough to bless them beyond what is in itself proper, and what the greatest good of the whole requires, but simply *as* the greatest good requires. Love for the saints and angels in heaven, going beyond this, would be a childish, partial affection. Love falling short of this would be imperfect and sinful from defect.

God loves, with a love of benevolence, *the inhabitants of hell*, and in the precise measure which has just been stated—not enough to screen them from merited punishment—that degree of punishment which their sins deserve, and which the highest good of the whole requires to be inflicted. For this, again, would be a childish, partial affection. It would be a *weakness*, an *imperfection* in the divine character. But God loves the miserable in hell enough to prevent him from punishing them beyond their deserts, or beyond what the greatest good of the whole demands. His benevolence towards them, therefore, is strictly impartial; and their sufferings are, in the largest and best sense, a *fruit of love*—love to the universe as a whole—a holy and benevolent regard for his own glory and the greatest good.

God loves *the world*,—not enough to save it at the expense of his own honor, and the greatest good: For this, again, would be a childish and a partial love. But he loves the world enough to devise and open a way in which salvation can be freely offered to it, in perfect consistency with his own honor as a sovereign, and the best interests of that universe over which he reigns. He loves the world enough to send his only begotten Son to die for it, so that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish but have everlasting life.

God loves *sinners under the gospel*, not enough to save

them in a rejection of the gospel, and while they pour contempt on its gracious provisions. But he loves them so well as to continue to them the abused blessings of his providence and the means of his grace,—as to strive with them, and cry after them, and do all that he consistently can do while probation lasts, to bring them to the knowledge and acceptance of offered mercy.

God loves *his own people in the world*, not enough to exempt them from needed afflictions and trials,—from that measure of chastisement which their best good requires. But he loves them too well either to afflict or prosper them otherwise than in faithfulness; either to give or withhold more than is consistent with a wise regard for his own glory and their highest interests.

In short, God is love to *beings in general*, and to *every individual being*, in fit and due proportion. He loves himself more than all other beings, because he is intrinsically worthy of such a measure of love. And he loves each individual of his creatures, from the highest to the lowest, from the greatest to the least, the good and the bad, the intelligent and the merely sentient, in exact proportion to its

God.* Love, benevolence, enters into and forms the basis of them all. Love is that essential ingredient, that "bond of perfectness" by which all are assimilated and united; so that in setting forth the moral excellence of the divine character we have only to say, in the expressive language of inspiration, that "God is love."

It is thought by many that this declaration is palpably inconsistent with the leading features of the orthodox faith. Orthodoxy, it is said, represents the Divine Being as arbitrary, partial, capricious, cruel; doing his whole pleasure without regard to his creatures; requiring beyond what they are able to perform, and punishing them out of all proportion to their deserts. Accordingly we find the declaration before us a favorite one with liberal religionists of nearly every description. They have it written over their pulpits, on their churches, on the covers of their Bibles, and we had almost said on "the borders of their garments."

Such being the case, it is important that we attempt to show that no one principle of sound orthodoxy is at all inconsistent with the Divine benevolence, or with the declaration that "God is love."

The doctrines most commonly supposed to contravene this declaration, are those of Divine sovereignty, of total depravity, of atonement, of election and reprobation, and of eternal punishment. Let us proceed, then, to an examination of each of these doctrines with a view to show its consistency with the Divine benevolence, and,

1. The doctrine of *Divine sovereignty.* What then is the doctrine of Divine sovereignty? This inquiry is more important, because the subject is so frequently misapprehended. There are those who will have it that the sovereignty of God is an arbitrary sovereignty; and who, whenever he is represented to them as a sovereign, can only think of him as a cruel, capricious being. What then is the true Christian doctrine of Divine sovereignty? It was well expressed by Nebuchadnezzar, that old monarch of Babylon, after the recovery of his reason, and after what, we hope, was his conversion. "He doeth according to his

* We speak here of these attributes, not in the abstract, but as *dispositions* or moral *affections* in the heart of God.

will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" Dan. iv. 35. In fewer words, the doctrine of Divine sovereignty is simply this: *God's right to do, and his actually doing just as he pleases.* He "hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and he hath compassion on whom he will have compassion," Rom. ix. 15. His "counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure," Is. xlvi. 10. But what does God please to do? This is a very important question. *What does God please to do?* Does he please to act unreasonably, arbitrarily, capriciously, cruelly? If this be true, then is he indeed an arbitrary and capricious sovereign. But is this true? Does any believer in Divine sovereignty so understand it? Unquestionably, God does as he pleases; but *he pleases to do for ever right.* He pleases to act perpetually and universally, according to the dictates of infinite wisdom and goodness. His pleasure is but another name for goodness, benevolence; and the doing of his pleasure—in other words, his sovereignty—is but the acting out of love. In this view—which is the view taken by all evangelical Christians—what is there so very frightful in the doctrine of Divine sovereignty, and how is it possible that there should be any inconsistency between the love and the sovereignty of God? The two doctrines harmonize exactly. The love of God being the grand motive and mainspring of sovereignty, and sovereignty being but the acting forth of love.

2. We come then to the second doctrine mentioned, viz. that of *total depravity.* Total depravity is rather an ambiguous phrase. To many persons it is an odious phrase, and yet, when properly explained, it expresses a great and important truth; a fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion. It is but another name for *entire sinfulness.* It implies, not that the subject of it is as bad as he can be, or that he is of necessity grossly vicious; or that he is destitute of all amiable social qualities, but that he is destitute of that holiness without which no man can see the Lord, and that all his moral exercises and affections are sinful, and such, the Scriptures assure us, is the state of the natural, unrenewed man everywhere. His heart is "full of evil," and "fully set in him to do evil," Eccl. viii. 11, ix. 3. "Every

imagination and thought of his heart is only evil, and that continually," Gen. vi. 5. In him, i.e., in his flesh, his carnal nature, "there dwelleth no good thing," Rom. vii. 18.

Nor is this melancholy fact at all inconsistent with the Divine benevolence.* It is not inconsistent with the character of a good being in *this* world, that he should have enemies. A good father may have malicious and rebellious children; a good sovereign may have unruly and wicked subjects. Our Lord Jesus Christ was goodness itself; and yet how many there were who hated him without a cause? So it is not at all inconsistent with the goodness and love of God, that he should have enemies—bitter, determined, implacable enemies. If it is not inconsistent with his goodness that men should sin *some*, no more is it that they should sin *all*—that they should make themselves entirely sinful—that they should become totally corrupted and depraved. God's goodness is not destroyed or diminished by the extent of man's wickedness. How can it be? He is not accessary to their wickedness. As moral governor he has no concern with it, except to prohibit it, to guard mankind against it by the severest penalties, and do all that he consistently can do to deliver those who have plunged into it from its terrific power, and efforts such as these, so far from being inconsistent with his love, are among its brightest manifestations.

3. The third doctrine mentioned is that of *atonement* by the blood of Christ. The apparent inconsistency between this doctrine and that of the Divine benevolence lies in God's causing an innocent person to suffer in place of the guilty, or (to use the language of the prophet) in his laying upon his own Son "the iniquities of us all;" and we freely acknowledge, that if the Son of God had been caused to suffer for us *against his will*, or *without his free and full consent*, the difficulty presented would be insuperable. The atonement would be founded in injustice and cruelty. But the sufferings of Christ were *not* laid upon him against his will. He was throughout a voluntary sufferer. When the

* We go not here into the fact of the *existence* of sin, but only into that of its *entire prevalence* in the unrenewed heart. Christians of every name believe that sin exists; and it devolves on all alike, liberal as well as orthodox, to reconcile this fact, if they can, with the perfection of the Divine government.

time had arrived for his appearance on earth, he is represented as saying, with the greatest alacrity, "Lo, I come,—in the volume of the book it is written of me,—to do thy will, O God," Ps. xl. 7. And while here on earth, and in the near prospect of his approaching sufferings and death, he said, "No man taketh my life from me, but *I lay it down of myself.* I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again," John x. 18. In this view, the whole aspect and character of our Saviour's sufferings are changed. He had a right to interpose in the manner he did, for the salvation of sinners, if he pleased; and if he was willing to make the sacrifice, there was no injustice or cruelty on the part of the Father in suffering him to do it. So far from this, an exhibition was here made of goodness, of mercy, of disinterested compassion and love, such as the universe never witnessed. Instead of being inconsistent with the love of God, the atonement of Christ was a most astonishing fruit and manifestation of love. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and gave his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John, iv. 10.

4. We proceed now to say that the Christian doctrine of *election* is not inconsistent with the declaration that "God is love." There can be no doubt that election *is* a doctrine of the Bible, and of course a Christian doctrine. It is referred to more than twenty times in the New Testament. Scarcely any of the great doctrines of religion are spoken of more frequently or expressly. But what is this so much perverted and detested doctrine of election? *What is it?* It supposes—what is true—that the race of man is already in a fallen, ruined state, sinners against God, and deserving to be cast off for ever; and it represents the great sovereign of heaven and earth as resolving, out of pure pity and mercy, and from all eternity, to interpose and save a portion of them; to save *all*, indeed, who will turn from their sins and freely accept the offers of his love. It represents him as determining to send forth his Spirit, and form all such ones in a meetness for heaven.

Such is the doctrine of election, as held by orthodox ministers and Christians generally; and is there anything in it, we now ask, at all inconsistent with the declaration that "God is love?" God might have left the entire race

of rebel man, as he did the rebel angels, to the dreadful consequences of their own sin; but in his boundless compassion, he determined to interpose on their behalf,—to make a difference in their favor. He determined to provide an all-sufficient Saviour, to send forth an almighty Spirit, and to save all those who should be brought to embrace Christ and put their trust in him. And now was not this determination on his part a most gracious and merciful one? So far from being inconsistent with the Divine benevolence, is it not a fruit, a manifestation, of that benevolence, sufficient to fill us with holy gratitude and rejoicing? And yet this determination, formed in eternity, and carried into effect in time, is no other than the decree of election.

5. We remark further, that there is nothing in the doctrine of *reprobation*, as understood by orthodox Christians, which is inconsistent with the Divine goodness. Against the doctrine of reprobation, there are even stronger prejudices, on the part of some, than against election. It is also a doctrine, like that of election, which is continually perverted and misrepresented. It is important therefore to inquire, as before, What is the doctrine of reprobation? What does it suppose? What inculcate? This doctrine supposes, like election, that man is in a guilty, ruined state, deserving to suffer the full penalty of the Divine law, which is eternal death; but that God, in mercy, has provided a Saviour, and has determined to save all those who believe and trust in him. And what is he to do with the remainder,—those who reject the Saviour, and turn away persistently from him? All such he has determined to *leave* to the terrible consequences of their own folly and sin. In the language of Scripture, he "gives them up unto their own hearts' lusts," Ps. lxxxi. 12. "He *gives them over* to a reprobate mind," Rom. i. 28. "He *suffers* them to walk in their own ways," Acts xiv. 16. And thus he purposed to do, from all eternity. This, then, is the doctrine of reprobation; and what is there in it, or about it, which is at all inconsistent with the Divine benevolence? It is not inconsistent with benevolence for God to provide a Saviour for guilty and lost men, —and to offer them salvation on easy terms,—and to decree the salvation of all those who embrace his offers. And is it inconsistent with benevolence for him to resolve to leave

the rest,—to abandon them to their own chosen way? God does not compel or constrain them to sin. He does not visit them with unmerited punishments. But as they pray to be excused from the gospel feast, he says to them, in righteous judgment, *Be excused.* As they will not come to Christ that they may have life; but reject all his offers, and abuse his love; he leaves them to fill up the measure of their sins, and so it was his purpose to treat them before the world began.

Perhaps some of my readers will say, "This is a very different view of the doctrines of election and reprobation from what we have been accustomed to entertain. We have supposed these doctrines to imply, that by an arbitrary decree, God destines some of the human family to salvation, and others to destruction, without any regard to their own characters or deserts, rendering it absolutely impossible for the former class to fail of heaven, or for the latter class to reach it." With regard to such representations of these doctrines, we can only say, that we are in no way responsible for them. We do not hold them, or defend them; nor do we

subsisting between himself and his intelligent creatures. He has made them what they are,—moral, accountable beings, proper subjects of law and government; and he has undertaken to administer a moral government over them. He has given them a perfectly good law, to be the rule of their actions; requiring them to love him with all the heart, and to love one another as they love themselves. To those who obey this law, he has promised every thing desirable and glorious as a reward; while upon those who transgress it, he has denounced a terrible but a just punishment. Is there anything inconsistent with goodness, *thus far*, in the administration of God towards his creatures? Surely it was good in him to make them what they are—rational, accountable, immortal beings. It was good in him to give them such a holy law, and to guard it with such a righteous penalty, and to institute for them, and over them, such a perfect moral government.

But if it was good in God to institute such a government, must it not be equally good to *maintain* it? To abandon it, now that he has set it up, would be to forfeit all its blessings. It would be the extreme of weakness and folly.

But how is a government of law to be maintained, unless the laws are faithfully executed? Let any sovereign begin to trifle with his law—to exact beyond it, or to fall below it; to withhold its rewards when merited, or to remit its penalties when deserved; and how long can such a government be respected? How long can it stand?

Be it remembered, then, if it was good in the Divine Being to institute a moral government over his creatures, it must be equally good in him to maintain it; and this can be done only by a faithful execution of law. The law must be honored and executed; the obedient must be rewarded, and the disobedient punished; not one jot or tittle must be allowed to pass from the law; or a government of law cannot stand. It must be subverted and overthrown.

In this view, any moral government, great or small, is just as benevolent in inflicting merited punishments, as it is in bestowing merited rewards. Our own government is as benevolent in erecting prisons as in erecting school-houses. It is as benevolent in confining thieves and hanging murderers as it is in bestowing offices and honors upon the

deserving, and the Divine government is as benevolent in shutting up the wicked in the prison of hell, as in receiving the righteous to the joys of heaven. The one is just as consistent with love, in the largest and best sense of the term, as the other.

There is another consideration to be taken into the account here. At an infinite expense, God has opened a way in which *sinners* of our race may be ransomed and saved. In the fulness of his compassion, he has provided for them a Saviour, and is offering them salvation on the easiest terms. A portion of them accede to his offers, and receive the blessings of pardon and eternal life. But others turn away in pride and scorn, and pertinaciously refuse the promised grace. They will not come to the Saviour, that they might have life. And now, what shall the great Sovereign of heaven and earth do with such contemners of his law, and despisers of his grace, but punish them for ever, as they deserve? And when he does punish them as they deserve, shall they turn round and impeach his goodness, and charge him with delighting in their blood? O no! no! Their enlightened consciences, in the last great day, will not suffer them to utter such a charge. And the conscience of the assembled universe will not endure to hear it. On the portals of that dark world in which the lost are to be imprisoned, will be inscribed not only that "our God is a consuming fire," but that "God is love."

There is yet another consideration, which shows the goodness of God in the eternal punishment of the wicked, and this is the fact that *they will never repent.* They will sin on, persistently, incorrigibly, for ever. The miserable in hell are not to be regarded as poor, pitiable objects, mourning over their sins, but finding no forgiveness; pleading for mercy, and yet mercy never comes. On the contrary, their hearts are still hard, and growing continually harder. They have not submitted to the justice which has overtaken them, and are more than ever determined that they never will. They literally "gnaw their tongues for pain, and blaspheme the God of heaven, but *repent not of their evil deeds.*" And now, I again ask, what is God to do with creatures such as these? What *can* he do, but to

keep them in the prisons provided for them, so long as they persist in their rebellion; and this will be for ever?

Perhaps no passage of Scripture has been so continually perverted and misapplied by a certain class of religionists, as that here remarked upon: *God is love.* The love which these persons ascribe to God is entirely inconsistent with his justice, and with any proper regard for his own authority, or for the general good. He cannot punish the guilty as they deserve,—he cannot even provide a place of punishment; for *he is love.* His justice must for ever sleep, and his enemies must be controlled by other means, or not at all; for *he is love.*

The love here ascribed to God we have described as a *childish, partial affection.* It is a love for his creatures, to the neglect of himself. It is a love for a part of his creatures, to the neglect of the rest. It is a love for the worst part of them, to the neglect and detriment of the better part. God loves the impenitent, the incorrigible, the abandoned so well, that he cannot bear to punish them; and so he suffers them to go on trampling on his authority, casting dishonor on his name, disturbing and contaminating the obedient portion of his subjects, till he has forfeited all respect as Ruler, and his righteous government is overthrown.

Such as this would be the love of a father for rebellious children—prompting to continued indulgence, and forbidding him to restrain and punish, till the order of his house was entirely subverted, and himself and wife, and all the obedient portion of his family, were literally turned out of doors. Such would be the love of a monarch or a magistrate for thieves and murderers, prompting him to weep and expostulate, when he ought to punish, while every public interest was endangered, and property and life were wantonly thrown away. It is amazing to see the delusion extensively prevailing among sensible people in regard to this subject. They persist in ascribing a kind of love to the Supreme Being which is inconsistent with all government, in the indulgence of which not an earthly kingdom under heaven, not a family, not even a common school, could be effectively governed for a single month.

Those whose fancies picture to themselves a God of this

sort will naturally love him. They have created him in imagination to suit themselves; and why should they not love him? They will find, however, that the God whom they have created is not the true God; that he has no existence out of themselves; and that their love for him is consistent with the sternest opposition to the mighty Monarch of heaven and earth.

Our God is, indeed, a God of love. But love to what? And in what measure? These questions have been answered already, and need not be formally considered again. Suffice it to say, that God does not love the wicked well enough to screen them from a merited punishment, to the dishonor of his name, and the detriment of his loyal and obedient subjects. He has loved a world of sinners enough to provide for them an almighty Saviour, but not enough to save them (even if it were possible), while they reject his Son, and pour contempt upon his blood. God is love; and just because he *is* love, he is a consuming fire to his incorrigible enemies—a fire that will burn to the lowest hell.

Let none of my readers, then, presume upon his love, while they persist in transgressing his laws, and despising the offers of his grace. His very love, in this case, will arm his power against them, and make it a matter of *official necessity* that he execute upon them the punishment he has threatened, which is eternal fire.

REMARKS.

1. The foregoing discussion is intended, and, we think, adapted, to remove one of the principal objections to the orthodox faith. The more common objections to orthodoxy are drawn, not so much from the Bible as from its alleged inconsistency with the goodness, the benevolence of God. There is an impression on the minds of *most* people,—even those who are furthest from religion,—that the Bible, in its more obvious meaning, does inculcate the orthodox doctrines. This, certainly, is the opinion of infidels, rationalists, and those who have cast off the authority of the Bible, almost without an exception. But then these doctrines are inconsistent with the moral perfection, the goodness of God, and consequently cannot be true. And hence the Bible, which seems to favor them, must be either rejected or

explained away. But we have endeavored to show, that between the doctrines of orthodoxy, rightly explained, and the Divine goodness, there is no discrepancy whatever. These doctrines are but the out-beamings, the manifestations of the Divine goodness, and cannot be inconsistent with it. They harmonize as naturally and as closely with the benevolence of God as they do with his word; and all objection to them, drawn from the same source we are now considering, is without foundation.

2. The views which have been given of the character of God, as consisting essentially in *goodness*, *benevolence*, represent him as a most glorious Being. The *natural* perfections of God, divested of goodness, would not constitute him glorious. Conceive, if you can, of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence, without goodness—all being directed by malice and selfishness, and would there be anything to love in such a Being? Would any glory attach to him? On the contrary, would he not be the most hateful and terrible thing in the universe; a God from whom no creature could hide, but from whom every creature would desire to flee away? But when we have invested the Supreme Being, as the Scriptures do, with all his adorable natural attributes, and placed them all under the direction and prompting of infinite goodness; when we contemplate his whole character as consisting in benevolence, in love, what character can possibly be more desirable and glorious; what being can be more worthy of our supreme affection, our highest confidence, and our devoutest aspirations of love and praise? With infinite wisdom to direct, and infinite goodness to prompt, and almighty power to execute; what can possibly be added to such a character, to render it more complete and perfect? What can be taken from it without rendering it less perfect? And who would not love such a character as this? What shall be thought of a race of creatures of whom the pen of inspiration has recorded: "They do not like to retain God in their knowledge;" who say to him, "Depart from us, for we desire not a knowledge of thy ways."

3. It follows from what has been said, that it is an unspeakable privilege to live under the government of God. *There are, indeed,* multitudes in this world, and in other

worlds, who do not thus regard it. They resist and oppose the government of God. The language of their hearts is: "We will not have this God to reign over us. Let us break his bonds asunder, and cast away his cords from us." But this unnatural rebellion against the government of God is no evidence of its imperfection, and no proof that it is not a privilege, great and precious, to live under it. Is it not a privilege to be the child of a wise and good parent here on the earth—one who protects and controls his household faithfully, and orders all their affairs with kindness and discretion? Is it not a privilege to live under a good government in *this world*—one that is wisely constituted and faithfully administered, where the interests of the subjects are efficiently protected, and the ends of government are all of them secured? And though some of the subjects may be displeased with such a government, and may try to overthrow it, is this any argument against its general wisdom and goodness? But if it is a privilege to be subject to a good father on earth, how much more to have an infinitely better Father in heaven? If it is a privilege to be blessed with a good government here, how much more to be under a *perfect* government, and the only perfect government in the universe? What a blessed privilege it must be to have our life and breath, our powers and faculties, our friends, our interests, and all our destinies in the hands of one who can make no mistakes, who can do no wrong thing, who will be sure to order every thing in wisdom and goodness, and whose wise and holy designs no enemy can ever thwart or defeat? And yet this privilege is ours. And it is our own fault if we do not know it, feel it, and rejoice in it. It is our own fault if this thought is not to each one of us, under all circumstances, whether of light or darkness, joy or sorrow, a source of unspeakable and enduring consolation.

4. If what has been said is true, then to oppose God, in any form, to hate his character, resist his government, and transgress his laws, is most unreasonable and dreadful. Why should any intelligent creature be displeased with the character of God? Is it not a holy character? Is it not a perfect character? It is all comprised in love—universal, impartial, disinterested love. It is a character of infinite

and unchangeable goodness. To hate it, therefore, is to hate goodness itself. It is to be displeased with that which is the perfection of moral excellence and beauty.

And why should any rise up against the government of God? Is it not a perfect government—founded in right, and administered in infinite wisdom and goodness? And then as to the law of God: is it not a perfectly good law? O how good had it been for this sin-stricken world if it had never been broken here! What light, and love, and joy, and peace would it have shed through all the habitations of men had the law of God been obeyed here on earth as it is in heaven?

And not only is opposition to God, in all its forms, in the highest degree unreasonable, it is also *dreadful*—dreadful, we mean, in its bearing on those who persist in it. The incorrigible enemies of God have absolutely nothing to hope for in the course they are pursuing, but every thing to fear. They sometimes hope in the love, the goodness of God; but his very goodness will arm his power against them, and they have really more to fear from God than though he was not good. For if God was not God, they would have reason to oppose him, and might have some hope in their opposition; but now they have no reason on their side, and no hope remains. Besides—if God was not good, he might, peradventure, be swayed from the path of right, and be led to favor them in their wicked designs; but such a ground of hope is now impossible. The holiness, the goodness, the absolute perfection of the Supreme Being, in connexion with his obligations as a Sovereign, *bind* him to pursue the workers of iniquity with a steady hand, and to overwhelm them, unless they repent, in an utter and endless ruin. Let them, then, take warning. Let them not further presume upon the goodness, the patience, the forbearance of their Maker. Why should they dare the great Jehovah to the conflict, and rush upon the thick bosses of the Almighty's buckler?

5. The views we have taken of the character of God are calculated to give us the most exalted conceptions of heaven. For heaven is the very metropolis of God's unbounded empire—the palace, the presence-chamber of the great King. *Not that God is* any more *really* present in heaven than he

is on earth, or in any other place or world. But there he is more *sensibly* present. It is here that he *manifests himself* most peculiarly and graciously. It is here, in a special manner, that he shows forth his glory. And it is this which *endears* heaven to all its blissful and glorified inhabitants. It is this, in fact, which constitutes heaven. The language of every heart in that upper world is that of the devout Psalmist: "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee?" "In thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures for ever more."

> "Not all the harps above
> Can make a heavenly place,
> If *God* his residence remove,
> Or but conceal his face."

But God never conceals his face from those blessed beings who surround his throne. For the trial of his people he does sometimes hide his face from them in the present world, but *never in heaven.* His presence and his glory beam forth there; a sun without any dark spots—one clear, unclouded, and eternal day, and all his people rejoice in him with a joy uninterrupted, unspeakable, and full of glory.

My beloved readers, are we prepared to go there? Are we prepared, in the spirit and temper of our minds, to participate in those heavenly joys? Is heaven begun in us here below? It must be begun here, in order to be consummated there. It must be begun here, or never. Let no one who reads these pages be deceived, or trust to an unfounded hope.

Art. III.—Dr. Berg's False View of the Second Advent.

The Second Advent of Jesus Christ, not Premillennial. By Joseph F. Berg, D.D., Pastor of the Second Reformed Dutch Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins, 1859.

We have had repeated occasion to notice the reluctance which antimillenarian writers exhibit, to test the question

between them and those who hold the doctrine of Christ's personal reign on the earth, by the laws of language and symbols. Not one of the long train of objectors to that and the other great teachings of the prophetic word that are associated with it, which we have reviewed, has chosen to try the points in discussion by those criteria. One class, like Dr. Brown of Glasgow, set up a preconceived and false theory of the great scheme of the divine government, as a test by which to determine the import of the prophecies; and either disregard whatever does not accord with their arbitrary dicta, or wrench and pervert it into seeming harmony with them. Another class, like Mr. Waldegrave, assume that the didactic and narrative Scriptures contain all the truths that are revealed in the sacred word; that the prophetic parts being more obscure, because couched in a measure in figures and symbols, ought to be interpreted by them; and consequently, that whatever their seeming sense may be, if construed by their proper laws, nothing which they teach, that is purely predictive, is to be received that can modify the views of the divine purposes we have drawn from the unprophetic portions of the word. A third class omit a formal consideration of the principles of interpretation as of little moment, and directing their assaults against the doctrine of Christ's personal reign, the reign with him of the saints, or other elements of the millenarian faith, under the pretext that they are inconsistent with the Redeemer's dignity, the nature of men, the ends of the divine administration, or some other facts or truths, rely for the accomplishment of their purposes on charges through that medium of falsehood, absurdity, or fanaticism. They accordingly contribute nothing directly to the final determination of the controversy: they only give fresh proof that the grounds on which they proceed are mistaken, and make it necessary again to point out the error of their theories, confute their misrepresentations, and rebuke their prejudices and scoffs.

Dr. Berg's disquisitions in this, and the very similar volumes that preceded it, are characterized by each of these errors. He openly avows that he makes his preconceptions of the offices and work of Christ the test by which he interprets the prophecies respecting his reign and kingdom. Sneers, scoffs, the imputation of false and revolting views

which no millenarian entertains, and slashing and vituperative declamation are his favorite instruments for overwhelming those whom he opposes; while the laws of the language and symbols through which the revelations are made are but slight barriers to his placing on them the most unwarrantable constructions, when their true meaning is at variance with his preconceived opinions. How vague his views are of the principles on which symbols are used, and with what confidence and eagerness he is capable of urging the most reasonless and preposterous constructions against the clear and emphatic teachings of the divine word, is seen from his volume entitled "*The Stone and the Image: or the* AMERICAN REPUBLIC," in which he maintains that "the stone cut out of the mountain without hands that smote the Image on the feet, and broke them in pieces, and itself became a great mountain and filled the whole earth," Dan. ii. 34–35, was the representative of "the American Republic," the United States;—a construction so farfetched, inapt, and contradictious to the prophecy, that no person at all aware of the principles of symbolization could for a moment entertain it. 1. In order that the descent of the stone may be conceived to have taken place naturally, the cliff or mountain from which it was cut, must be regarded as towering immediately behind the image, so that the stone, on being disengaged from the brow of the precipice, descended by its own weight, and struck the image on its feet, and, precipitating it forward, passed over and crushed its whole mass to dust. To conceive it as borne from a cliff, or mountain of a distant continent, across not only the Atlantic, but a large breadth of both Africa and Asia, is unnatural and incongruous. 2. The cutting of the stone from the mountain without hands, expressly indicates that it was not to be the product, nor implement in any measure, of human instrumentality. The power that disengaged it from the mountain, and sent it on its mission, was divine. 3. The stone is interpreted by the Spirit of God in the prophecy, as symbolizing a kingdom which God, in contradistinction from men, is to set up, and that is to break in pieces and consume all those kingdoms represented by the image. But the American Republic is no more set up by the God of heaven in distinction from men, than the kingdoms denoted

by the head, breast, and limbs of the image, or its ten toes. It has no more, as a political empire, the characteristics of God's kingdom, than the English provinces of Canada and Nova Scotia, England itself, Prussia, the Sandwich Islands, or New Zealand. It is the work of man, as absolutely as they are. 4. The kingdom which God is to set up on the destruction of those denoted by the image, is explicitly defined in the parallel prophecy, Dan. vii. 13–27, as the kingdom of which the Messiah is to be the king, and in which the saints of the Most High, who have been persecuted by the beast, are to reign with him. The horn of the beast that had eyes, is to make war with the saints, and prevail against them, till the ancient of days comes, when the beast is to be slain, and the saints of the Most High are to receive judicial authority and possess the kingdom. The wild beast of ten horns, Dr. Berg admits, is the symbol of the same ten kingdoms of Western Europe as are represented by the ten toes of the image. But it is expressly foreshown, Dan. vii. 9–11, that the powers denoted by the beast are to be destroyed in the presence of the Ancient of days, by the avenging flames that are to stream from his throne; and, Rev. xix. 11–21, that Christ and the armies of his saints are to seize the beast and false prophet, and cast them into the lake of fire. And this last is admitted by Dr. Berg. It is against the most indubitable teaching of the prophecy itself, therefore, to maintain that the destruction of the powers denoted by the feet of the image, and the wild beast of ten horns, is to be the work of the American Republic. It is worse than an absurd mistake. It is to make the head of this Republic and Christ the same; and the other officials of the United States the same as the risen and glorified saints! 6. As the stone that broke the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth, symbolized a kingdom, and a kingdom that is to stand for ever, the assumption that that kingdom is the American Republic, is the assumption that the American Republic is not only to destroy all the present governments of Europe by military force—for that is his theory of its agency—but is in like manner to conquer every other kingdom in the world, incorporate in itself the whole human family, and continue its sway over them as long as the world stands. 7. And finally, to complete this climax

of absurdity and monstrosity, all this is to take place before the millennium, which Dr. Berg holds is already beginning to flash its first rays up the eastern sky! pp. 178, 179. This is a fair specimen of the shallowness and extravagance of his speculations.

We propose to criticise his work, not because we attach any peculiar importance to his opinions, but simply to point out the untenableness and wildness of his leading views, and protect the word of God from the misconceptions and perversions to which he subjects it. He opens his volume with a volley of coarse denunciations of Millenarianism, and assails the doctrine itself of Christ's speedy coming and reign on the earth as necessarily engendering a spirit of fanaticism and leading to wild excesses and fatal delusions.

"No scheme that has ever received so many respectable vouchers presents so many fatal incongruities; and the more attentively it is scrutinized the more we are persuaded will this conviction grow upon the mind, unless it should unhappily be already hopelessly committed in another direction."—P. vi. "We cannot do otherwise, in our position, than regard *the doctrine of the* PREMILLENNIAL ADVENT, *and the so called* PERSONAL REIGN OF CHRIST, as *erroneous* and therefore, *eo ipso*, *pernicious*, for we never yet have heard of an innocent error in matters of faith. Besides the *history* of this dogma yokes it in its general career to the car of fanaticism, and impeaches it as *the motive power* in some of the wildest vagaries that have ever reproached the Christian name."—P. vii. "A full report of its excentric variations from the orbit of Christian sobriety would fill volumes. It has been the favorite hobby upon which wild delusion has careered with whip and spur to perdition. It has changed sincere fanatics into shameless impostors, and it has furnished artful and designing men with the key note to which they have pitched their pipe, that others that were not wise might dance to their music. This we affirm, and all history shall furnish the witnesses."—P. viii.

These are but specimens from pages of similar imputations. The doctrine, according to him, has had the effect in every age to make men monsters of vice, and drive them to madness. It takes the sting, however, from his accusation that it is in fact directed against the doctrine itself of the

Scriptures that Christ is to come in person a second time, and reign in visible glory over those whom he redeems;—not exclusively of that, against Millenarianism. For what he alleges is, that "the doctrine of Christ's premillennial," that is, his speedy "advent," *eo ipso* necessarily produces the mischievous effects which he asserts have resulted from it. If the great purpose Christ has revealed to come a second time in person and in power and great glory thus necessarily, when brought before the minds of men, drives them into gross forms of fanaticism and wickedness, the fault plainly lies in the doctrine itself, not in those who have received and taught it heretofore, or who receive and teach it now: and the objection to it will be as legitimate when the moment of Christ's second advent approaches and arrives as it can be at the present day. It is thus, unfortunately for Dr. Berg, the Redeemer himself whom he arraigns with so much vehemence. It is the purpose he has himself revealed to come a second time, which he denounces in these scornful and opprobrious terms! And he seems to have forgotten, not only that Christ has made known that purpose, but that he has foreshown also that the apprehension of his coming, and his coming itself, are to strike mankind universally with alarm and excite them to agitations and terrors no other epoch is to witness. "When the sign of the Son of Man shall appear in heaven then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn." "Behold he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so. Amen." If the agitation and alarm which the belief of Christ's speedy coming now produces, are a proof that the doctrine is false and mischievous, is not the fact that the sign of his coming, and his coming itself, when it takes place, are to strike the race with such dismay and despair, equal proofs of its falsehood and perniciousness? But perhaps Dr. Berg will attempt to escape from this antagonism to the divine word by the pretext, that his objection is not against the doctrine itself of Christ's second coming, but against some false adjuncts of that doctrine. Then though that pretext is against his explicit language and the whole tenor of his denunciations, his objection is not against Millenarianism, but *something* extraneous to it, and his whole war on the

doctrine is abandoned. For if it is not the doctrine of Christ's personal coming that he assails and denounces, what element of Millenarianism is it? That is the only point that is in debate on this branch of the subject, between Millenarians and Antimillenarians. If he admits that Christ is to come in person and in glory; that the time will at length arrive when his advent will be contemplated as nigh, and that when thus contemplated, and when it actually takes place, it will naturally and justly overwhelm the race with consternation, then he grants all, in regard to this particular, for which Millenarians contend, and makes himself as obnoxious to his denunciations as he holds they are, on whom he lavishes them with so much passion.

In like manner, his impeachment of the doctrine of Christ's personal reign on the earth, is an impeachment of the purpose God has expressly revealed that he should assume the sceptre of the earth and reign over it as his empire. For it is foreshown, Dan. vii. 13, 14, that at Christ's second coming, he is to be invested with a dominion and kingdom, that all nations should serve him, and that that dominion and kingdom are to continue for ever; and, Isaiah ix. 6, 7, that that dominion is to be exercised by him on the throne of David. "Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice for ever. It is foreshown also, Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD, OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." So also it was announced by Gabriel to Mary, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i. 32, 33; Rev. xi. 15, also Zech. xiv. 9; Psalm ii. and lxxii., and many other passages. These prophecies thus foreshow in the clearest manner that Christ is, at his second coming, to receive the earth as his peculiar kingdom, and reign over it in person, Matt. xxv.

31, 32, and that all nations are to bend in submission to his sceptre, and worship him as present in the majesty of his glorified humanity. Dr. Berg, accordingly, in rejecting and denouncing this doctrine as false and pernicious, rejects what God has thus distinctly revealed, and charges that it necessarily leads men to fanaticism and profligacy. Should he deny it—which he cannot without the most flagrant self-contradiction—and claim that he only rejects some adjuncts Millenarians have added to the doctrine, then he abandons his denunciation of the doctrine itself of Christ's personal reign on the earth, and has no longer any controversy with Millenarians in regard to the fact that it is the doctrine of the prophetic Scriptures.

Should he attempt to escape from this embarrassing antagonism to the Divine word, by affirming that he does not absolutely deny Christ's personal reign, he only maintains that this earth is not to be the scene of it, but heaven; admit, as we do, that it is so; and yet it yields him no exculpation for the charge that the doctrine of Christ's personal reign is *eo ipso* pernicious and necessarily drives men to fanaticism and the perpetration of gross crimes. For if those are its necessary effects, it must produce them in heaven with as infallible a certainty as on the earth. If such is its natural and unavoidable tendency, how can Dr. Berg prove that it will not reveal that nature and give birth to those results as certainly in any other world as this? If the personal presence and reign of Christ in his glory on earth, must certainly drive his own people who are renewed after his likeness and under the sway of the Holy Spirit, to wild extravagances of passion, and gross violations of the laws of morality, how can it be supposed that it will exert any better influence on the children of God in any other world?

Dr. Berg's arraignment of this part of Millenarianism is thus nothing less than a direct impeachment of the great purpose revealed in the Scriptures, that Christ is to come in person a second time to the earth, and reign openly and in power and glory over mankind, and charge that such a direct manifestation of himself to them and personal reign over them, must necessarily drive them into the most debased and odious forms of sin. If he concedes that Christ

may reveal himself openly in heaven and reign there in visible majesty, compatibly with the safety and well being of the redeemed, and of the various orders of angels, and other ranks of intelligences who may dwell in his presence, how can he show that his coming in power and glory and reigning in majesty over mankind on the earth, will not be equally compatible with and promotive of their highest well-being?

He will, perhaps, endeavor to extricate himself from this unfortunate position, by the pretext he alleges, in his tirade against the doctrines of Christ's coming and reign, that it has in every age led those who have received it, into gross extravagances and sins. To that accusation, uttered with so much assurance, we offer a direct denial. The Millenarians of the early ages, were distinguished for their evangelical faith and the purity of their morals. Munzer and his brood, with the infamy of whose crimes, Dr. B. attempts to brand the doctrine, were not Millenarians. So far from it, they denied that Christ was to reign in person on the earth, and held that they themselves, and in the natural life, were to reign as kings and priests in his name;—a doctrine very much like that held by Dr. Berg himself, who maintains that the American republic is to be the basis of the millennial kingdom, and that those who hold the supreme power in that, are to exert a like sway over all the other tribes and kingdoms of the earth.

Dr. Berg's first assault on the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign, is thus a charge that it is false, because demoralizing, and is thence an impeachment of the Saviour himself, and would, if legitimate, overturn not only Millenarianism, but the throne of God. "For Christ is exalted to the right hand of the Majesty on high, we are told, for the express purpose of revealing himself in his glorified human nature to all the unfallen intelligences in his empire, and bringing every knee to bow of those who are in heaven and those who are upon the earth, and every tongue to confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father." If, then, as Dr. B. represents, such a revelation of himself to them, and reign over them in visible majesty, must necessarily drive them to fanaticism, and plunge them into gross sin, what can the effect of his exaltation and reign in

heaven be, but the demoralization and ruin of his whole intelligent empire!

Such is the issue of Dr. Berg's opening onset on the doctrine he so passionately assails! And it is a fair specimen of the superficiality, the rashness, the misrepresentation, the contradictoriness to the Scriptures that characterize his volume.

II. He next attempts to overturn the doctrine by the charge that it is inconsistent with certain essential truths of the gospel, which he arbitrarily sets up as criteria of the meaning of the Messianic prophecies.

"Every interpretation of prophecy must accord with the great fundamental doctrines of the gospel, in order to entitle it to intelligent Christian notice or respect. If an exposition contradicts any one of the leading principles of the gospel plan, if it destroy the harmony or order of the system of divine truth, that exposition is erroneous, and must be rejected. For example, here are the four great truths which we noticed in a former chapter, as comprising an epitome of the gospel: Christ was slain on the cross for our offences. He was raised for our justification. He has ascended to heaven, entering the Holy of Holies, of which the most holy place in the Jewish temple was the type, entering it as our representative and forerunner, thereby assuring us, by a living pledge, that we who believe and love the Lord Jesus shall in due season be with him where he is, and be like him for ever. And finally, Christ shall come again once more in his glorified humanity to judge the quick and the dead, to gather his saints to himself, that they may inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, and to banish the wicked from his presence for ever. That these doctrines are the substance of the gospel all Christians admit, avow, and proclaim. Now, I say, no interpretation of prophecy which destroys the harmony of this brief system is worthy of our acceptance, for God will not make void his own counsel. Therefore an exposition of the millennial prophecies which severs this chain is a vicious and a false interpretation. The Millenarian theory does this thing. It takes Jesus Christ from the Holy of Holies, the true heaven, where he must abide, as our Intercessor, until his intercessory work is done, until the last soul that shall ever come to God by him has been sealed by the Holy Ghost to the day of redemption; and it plants the Redeemer upon Mount Zion, as the King of the Jews. There-

fore, I argue, the millennial scheme, in its interpretations of prophecy, in its expositions of Scripture, is a false and a vicious theory; and consequently a system must be adopted which shall harmonize with the established principles of the gospel of Christ."—Pp. 51–53.

He thus constitutes these doctrines as a "system," a criterion of the meaning of the prophetic Scriptures, a rule of interpretation; alleges that they are inconsistent with the "theory" of Christ's personal reign on the earth; and thence maintains that such constructions must be placed on the prophecies, no matter what they teach according to the laws of language and symbols, as shall erase from them the doctrine of Christ's reign on the earth. But this is nothing else than an attempt, by an arbitrary and false assumption, to set aside the revelations God has made, and substitute Dr. Berg's antagonistic speculations in their place; and is so palpably such, that did not Dr. Berg show, in every part of his volume, that he is no thorough master of the subjects he discusses; that he is capable of being misled by the most transparent fallacies, and of rejecting the most indubitable truths, we should not find it easy to persuade ourselves that he is not aware of the utter unjustifiableness of such a method of determining the meaning of the Divine word. How is it that Dr. Berg became possessed of the right he here arrogates, of deciding that the construction *he* places on one part of the word of God is an infallible criterion of the purposes that are revealed, and the doctrines that are taught in its other parts? Has he any more authority to claim that prerogative than Catholics, Unitarians, Universalists, Rationalists, or any other parties have, who wish to get rid of its genuine teachings? He can see that Papists and Anabaptists, and Millerites are unpardonable in resorting to such expedients to justify their false notions. How is it that he can regard it as innocent and a mark of rectitude and wisdom in himself? Or why is it that he presents that *group* of doctrines as demonstrations of the error of Millenarianism; as though each were in his judgment in equal antagonism to it? Was it for any other purpose than to give a more imposing air to his argument? He does not attempt to show that any but the last, is in any

relation inconsistent with the Redeemer's personal reign on the earth: nor could he. That "Christ was slain on the cross for our offences" is no obstacle to his reigning as God-man on the earth: so far from it, his having a human nature that could be put to death on the cross, and his submission to that death on our behalf are necessary conditions of his reigning in our world: for his exaltation to supreme power, and reception of the sceptre of the earth, as well as of the heavenly realms, were consequences of his death on the cross, Philip. ii. 5–11. Nor is his resurrection from death "for our justification," any obstacle to his reigning on the earth. Instead, it is a necessary condition of it. Had he not been raised, he could not himself have been justified, and thence could not have justified his people; nor could he have been glorified and reigned in our nature. Can anything exceed the inconsiderateness and folly of alleging these indispensable prerequisites of his reigning on the earth, as insuperable obstacles to it? Neither is his ascension to heaven and reign on the throne of the universe for a series of ages, any obstacle to his subsequent reign here. So far from it, that ascension and reign in heaven are preparatives, we are expressly taught, for his assuming the sceptre of the earth and reigning in glory here. He is to sit at the right hand of the Father only till his enemies are made his footstool, Ps. cx. 1., and the "heavens are to retain him only until the times of the restitution of all things which God has foreshown by the mouth of all the prophets," Acts iii. 21. Then the kingdom of this world is to become his, that all nations may serve him; and he is to reign for ever and ever, Dan. vii. 13, 14; Rev. xi. 15. And his reign in heaven during the present dispensation, is undoubtedly an essential prerequisite to his reigning on the earth and exercising the sway by which he is then to deliver the race from the thraldom of sin, and restore it to sanctitude and blessedness: and essential, on the one side, by the displays which man makes of himself, that demonstrate his need of such a redemption as Christ accomplishes; and on the other, by the communication of such a knowledge of Christ's work to the unfallen ranks of God's creatures, as shall prepare them to comprehend the grace and wisdom of the administration he is to exercise when he

establishes his throne on the earth, and brings all nations and individuals to partake of his mercy, Philipp. ii. 5–12; Eph. iii. 10. Nor finally, can his coming "again in his glorified humanity to judge the quick and the dead, to gather his saints to himself, that they may inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, and to banish the wicked from his presence for ever," be any obstacle to his receiving the earth as his kingdom and reigning over it for ever. Instead, it is in order to it, and an indispensable prerequisite. How can Christ reign here in person, unless he returns from heaven "in his glorified humanity," and manifests himself here in the form in which he now reigns at the right hand of the Majesty on high? What can surpass the contradictoriness and absurdity of this pretext, that these necessary conditions of his reign on the earth, are invincible obstacles to it?

Dr. Berg, however, assumes that the return of Christ to the earth and reign here, would intercept him from his office of intercessor in the presence of the Father, and are therefore inconsistent with the doctrine that his intercessions are to continue till the work of redemption is accomplished; and the validity of his argument depends wholly on the legitimacy of this assumption:—the four great doctrines of Christ's death, resurrection, ascension, and second coming presenting no basis for it whatever. But what authority has Dr. Berg for that assumption? There is nothing in the Scriptures to justify it. He plainly presumes in it, on the one side, that the Father cannot receive Christ's intercessions unless it be in the identical scene in which they are now presented in heaven; and on the other that Christ cannot intercede, unless he be personally present in the scene in which the Father receives his intercessions. But what evidence has Dr. Berg of those extraordinary postulates? There is nothing in the Scriptures, there is nothing in the divine nature to support them. As the Father is omnipresent and omniscient, why may he not receive the intercessions of Christ, if offered on earth, as well as if offered in heaven? Or if it be supposed that his intercessions are to be presented in a scene in which the Father reveals himself, has Dr. Berg yet to learn that it is expressly shown that the Father is to reveal himself as well as the Lamb, in the New Jerusalem, the symbol of the risen

saints who are to reign with Christ on the earth? On John's seeing the holy city the New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, he heard a great voice, saying: Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, their God," and the apostle adds, "I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it," "and the throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it." As the Father is then to manifest himself in his glory in the presence of the risen and glorified saints on the earth, as he now does in the presence of the angels in heaven; if the intercessions of Christ must necessarily be offered where he visibly manifests himself, the earth not only may, but will be that scene.

But the utter groundlessness of Dr. Berg's assumption is not its only objectionable feature. It is in open contradiction to the great doctrine that Christ's priesthood and intercessions are to continue for ever, and leads him to reject their perpetuity, and teach that they and the work of redemption are to terminate at his second coming. For in asserting that "our Intercessor" "must abide" "in the Holy of Holies, the true heaven," "until his intercessory work is done, until the last soul that shall ever come to God by him has been sealed by the Holy Ghost to the day of redemption;" he assumes that Christ's intercessions and his whole work in redeeming men, will close when he returns from heaven at his second coming. The Scriptures however teach that he is to be a priest for ever, and that his intercessions and the redemption of men are to continue for ever. "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek," Ps. cx. 4. "But he, because of his abiding to eternity, has an unchangeable priesthood. Whence he is able for ever to save those coming unto God through him, always living to make intercession for them," Heb. vii. 24, 25. Here the endlessness of his life and the perpetuity of his priesthood are given as reasons that he is for ever to be able to save those who come unto God through him, because he can make intercession on their behalf; which indicates that persons are for ever to come unto God through him, and that he is for ever to intercede for, and save them. Dr. Berg's theory

of his intercession is thus shown by its contradiction to these doctrines of the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood, and the continuance through eternal ages of the work of redemption, to be wholly mistaken. His attempt accordingly to overthrow Millenarianism by the pretext that it is inconsistent with Christ's death, resurrection, ascension, and second coming, issues in his own confutation. It is he who contradicts the specific teachings of the divine word, not Millenarians. It is he, not Millenarians, who would intercept Christ from his work, and exclude infinite millions from redemption by him, in order to sustain an absurd preconception he has formed, of the administration the Almighty is to exercise in the ages to come over our race.

III. Dr. Berg, instead of attempting, by arbitrary and mistaken criteria, to determine the question whether Christ is to come at the commencement of the thousand years, and reign in person on the earth, should have addressed himself to the great passages which Millenarians regard as foreshowing his pre-millennial advent and reign, and demonstrated, if in his power, that interpreted by the just laws of language and symbols, they do not present such a revelation. If he felt inadequate or reluctant to this, he should not undertake to discuss the subject. To evade a determination of the question by the word of God; to set up tests that are far-fetched, unreal, and that overthrow himself; to resort to inconsiderate and presumptuous assumptions, and rely for their support and the overthrow of those whom he assails, on a continuous din of loud-voiced assertion and denunciation, is only to betray the cause he affects to advocate, and discredit himself.

Why then is it that he avoids the proper consideration of those passages? He enters into no critical examination of them. He makes no attempt by the indubitable laws of language and symbols, to test the truth of the meaning ascribed to them by Millenarians. He either passes them without notice, or contents himself with arbitrarily denying their genuine meaning, or assigning them a sense that divests them of their antagonism to his theory. There must be some very cogent reason for this procedure. What is it? Is it ignorance of the proper method of determining the question at issue? Is it that his theory has usurped the

place of the word of God in such a degree in his mind, that the latter has lost its authority? Or is it that prejudice has so blinded his perceptive powers, that he is unable to see any proofs on the sacred page, however numerous and palpable they may be, of his error?

The principal of these passages are those of Isaiah, Daniel, Zechariah, the Gospels, Thessalonians, and Revelation, in which it is foreshown that Christ's second coming is to take place at the destruction of the powers denoted by the wild beast, and the man of sin, the restoration of the Israelites, and the conversion of the nations; and the question in respect to their import is, whether the coming of Christ which they exhibit and predict, is his real personal coming, or only some wholly different and inferior event, either of providence, or the agency of men? Now though Dr. Berg omits a critical interpretation of these and other kindred passages, and affects to settle the meaning of such of them as he notices by a dash of his pen, he yet admits enough in regard to them, to overthrow his theory, and verify the sense ascribed to them by Millenarians. These passages are of two classes: First, those like Daniel vii. 13, 14; Rev. vi. 16, and xix. 11–21, in which, in vision, the prophet beheld Christ coming in the clouds with power and glory; and the question is, whether that coming in vision symbolizes his real personal coming in clouds at the period when the prophecy of the vision is to be fulfilled? If it does, then it is a revelation that Christ's second coming is to precede the millennium; inasmuch as the advent in the visions took place at the time of the destruction of the wild beast; and Dr. Berg concedes that the destruction of the powers denoted by the wild beast, is to take place anterior to the millennium.

Now, Dr. Berg admits and affirms that the appearance of Christ in the vision, Rev. xx. 11–15, is a symbol of his real personal appearance in the clouds at the last resurrection and judgment of men.

"Concurrent testimony has been adduced from the word of God as evidence that the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in the power and glory of heaven, as the mighty Judge of the living and *the dead, is to follow* and not to precede the millennium—

and if any further corroboration of the argument were needed, it is furnished with overwhelming demonstration in the twentieth chapter of the Revelation of St. John. The words from the first to the sixth verse relate strictly to the millennial period: the four verses following narrate the last conflict with Satan, when loosed out of his prison, he goes forth to deceive the nations. After this we read the story of the judgment of the great day, accompanied by *the appearing of the Lord Jesus.* 'And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.' . . . Compare this language with our Saviour's prediction in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew;—'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations.' And it would seem as though it were almost a waste of words to labor to establish the identity of the import of these two passages. If this be admitted, then the second coming of Christ beyond all doubt, follows the millennium."—Pp. 129–131.

He thus interprets Christ's appearance in that vision in his character as Lord and Judge, as a symbol of his real personal appearance in that character in the sky of our world at the time to which the vision refers; and on the principle that his visible appearance in a prophetic vision, and acting a part in the events that are foreshown in it, is a prophecy of his real appearance in the scene which the vision represents, and acting that part when the prophecy has its accomplishment. For there is no other principle on which he can place that construction. If Christ's appearing in such a vision and acting a part in the prophetic transactions that took place in it, is not a symbol and proof that he is to appear in person and act a corresponding part in the scene which the vision represents, then his appearing in the vision of the judgment, Rev. xx. 11–15, is no proof that he is to appear when the events foreshown in that prophecy take place; and Dr. Berg has no evidence of the truth of his construction.

But in admitting that principle, as he does, he places himself under a necessity, for the same reason, of admitting that the appearance of Christ in the vision, Rev. xix. 11–21, in which he descended from heaven with his armies, to judge and make war on the beast and destroy it and the false prophet, is a symbol and proof that he is to come in person and glory at the destruction of the powers denoted by those symbols; and likewise that his coming in the clouds of heaven at the destruction of the beast, Dan. vii. 9–14, is a symbol and proof of his coming in person at that epoch, receiving the dominion of the earth, and entering on a reign over the nations that is to continue for ever; and so also in the vision, Rev. vi. 16: and thence that the second coming of Christ is to precede instead of following the thousand years. He cannot offer any pretext that Christ's appearance in those visions is not a symbol and proof of his personal appearance in the scenes which they foreshow, that will not equally prove that his appearance in the vision of the resurrection and judgment, Rev. xx. 11–15, is not a symbol nor proof of his appearance in the scene which that represents. By his construction of this vision, therefore, he in effect concedes that Christ's second coming is represented in the vision, Rev. xix. and vi., and Dan. vii., and thence is to precede instead of following the millennium. He admits indeed, formally, that Christ is the personage who is denominated the King of kings and Lord of lords in the vision, Rev. xix. 11–21, that the event to which that vision relates is the destruction of the wild beast, and that that destruction is immediately to precede the commencement of the millennium. Yet he endeavors to wrench the vision from its true meaning, and make Christ and his armies mere representatives of men in the natural life, and of the leaders and armies of the "American Republic!"

"That the personage typified by the titles, Faithful and True, the Word of God, the King of kings and Lord of lords, can mean no other than Jesus Christ, is perfectly obvious; his eyes as a flame of fire; the many crowns upon his head; the name written which no man knew but himself; his raiment, the vesture dipped in blood; are all typical of attributes and offices which pertain to no creature but manifestly point, as well as the

titles which he bears, to the Mighty Redeemer; but all the symbols as plainly indicate that it will not be *a literal appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ* in heavenly glory. He here appears as riding upon a white horse, and the armies in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen white and clean; the fine linen indicating the purity of their character. The symbols clearly represent the mustering of the armies of righteousness who hold fast the truth as it is in Christ, and who follow him as the glorious leader who goes forth conquering and to conquer. The nature of the conflict in which they engage is also indicated by the symbols which describe the overthrow of the enemies of Jesus Christ. It is not a spiritual conflict like that between Michael and his angels, and the dragon and his angels, but it is a physical contest. After the beast and the false prophet are taken and cast alive into the burning lake, the remnant are slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceedeth out of his mouth, and all the fowls are filled with their flesh;—indicating that they fall under the curse of the law which condemns them, and that they perish in this war of Antichrist against him who is Faithful and True."

"This battle of that great day of God Almighty, is the last event included under the seventh vial, and the connexion seems to intimate, that it is the immediate precursor of the millennium." —The Stone and the Image, pp. 175, 176.

He thus admits that the great personage in the vision, is the Lord Jesus Christ, that he descends from heaven to earth, and fights in the battle, that the wild beast and false prophet are destroyed in it and their armies, and that their destruction immediately precedes the millennium. He maintains, however, that Christ's appearance and action in the vision, are not symbols of his personal presence and action in the scene it represents; but instead, only denote that he is to be the leader, in a wholly different sense, of armies of men who are to destroy the antichristian powers: and he gives as the reason of that construction, that the contest is to be a physical, not a spiritual one. But that is arbitrary and mistaken. That the object of the contest is to be the destruction of the wild beast and false prophet and their armies, is no proof that Christ is not the symbol of himself in the vision, and is not to appear in person in the scenes it foreshows, and exert the acts in the destruction of his foes, which the vision ascribes to him. It is foreshown

in many passages that at his second coming in flaming fire, he is to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that it is by the breath of his mouth that the man of sin is to be consumed, and by the brightness of his manifestation that he is to be destroyed. The symbols which betoken the office he is on that occasion to fill toward his enemies, such as the horse on which he sat, the sword proceeding from his mouth, and the armies that followed him, do not indicate that he is not to be present at the verification of the vision, and exert the acts which his acts in the vision properly represent. The supposition is as erroneous and contradictory to the prophecy as it were to assume that the throne on which he sat in the vision of the last judgment, and the books that were opened, are proofs that he is not to be present at the fulfilment of *that* prophecy, and exert the acts which it ascribes to him. He descends, the prophet declares, at the conflict with the beast and the hosts leagued with it, "to judge and make war, to smite the nations with the sword proceeding from his mouth, and to tread the wine press of the fierceness of the wrath of God." And he appeared as an avenging warrior and destroyer, because it is in that character that he is to employ the consuming fires with which he is to be armed, on the hosts that are to be assembled to prevent him from the redemption of the Israelites, who will have returned to Jerusalem, and the establishment on the earth of his kingdom, Zech. xiv. 1–15, and it was he accordingly who caused the wild beast and false prophet to be taken and cast into the lake of fire and brimstone—acts to which men in the natural life, are wholly inadequate—and he also directly exerted the acts by which the armies gathered against him were destroyed. The supposition, therefore, that he is not to appear in the sense which the vision represents, and exert the great acts it assigns him, is wholly groundless, and inconsistent with the law of symbolization. What more preposterous contradiction to it can be conceived, than the construction Dr. Berg places on it; who makes Christ the mere symbol of men in the natural life, and of the leaders of armies of "the American Republic," whom he regards the justified saints as representing? Could folly and fanaticism devise a more revolting carica-

ture? Such are the expedients to which he resorts to evade the revelation here made in so clear and impressive a form, that Christ's second advent is to take place at the overthrow and destruction of the civil powers denoted by the wild beast. He endeavors also to justify his construction by the pretext that if Christ comes in person at the commencement of the thousand years, then his appearance at the judgment that is to follow that period, must symbolize a third advent; the supposition of which is in contradiction to the Scriptures, which foreshow only a second coming. But in that representation Dr. B. assumes that Christ will have closed his reign on the earth at the termination of the thousand years, and resumed the throne of heaven: as otherwise a return again to the earth would not be necessary, in order to his personal presence at the final judgment, foreshown Rev. xx. 11–15. But how has Dr. Berg learned that Christ will return to heaven at the close of the thousand years? There is no intimation of it in the prophecy. It is a mere figment of his fancy; and against the specific revelation, Dan. vii. 14, and Rev. xi. 16, that the reign on which Christ is to enter on the earth at the overthrow of the wild beast, is to continue for ever. Dr. Berg thus by his construction of Christ's appearance in the vision of the last judgment as symbolizing his personal presence at the judgment, which that vision foreshows, places himself under the necessity of construing his appearance in the vision of the destruction of the wild beast and the armies that attend it, as symbolizing his real personal presence in the scene which that vision foreshows; and thereby admitting that his second coming is to take place at the commencement of the thousand years.

He must for the same reason admit that Christ's coming in the clouds in the vision, Dan. vii. 13, 14, and receiving the sceptre of the world that all nations should serve him, is a symbol of his second coming, and that it is to take place at the destruction of the powers denoted by the wild beast, at the commencement of the reign of the saints, as the prophecy represents his coming as coincident with the destruction of the beast, and the reign of the saints as immediately following the extinction of that power and the commencement of his dominion which is to endure for ever. That that is the true import of the prophecy, is certain more-

over from its being quoted by Christ—when adjured by the high priest to declare whether he was the Messiah—as to have its fulfilment in his personal and visible coming in the clouds of heaven. Matt. xxvi. 64.

Dr. Berg places a construction on Matt. xxiv. 29–31, that implies with like certainty that Christ's second coming is to precede the millennium.

"In the present instance St. Matthew puts on record the answers of Christ to two, or if you choose, three great distinct and yet analogous inquiries, and the application of these answers to each particular inquiry, must be determined, not only by the order in which those answers follow, but also by the *nature* of the answers. Therefore it will not be consonant with this rule to represent the destruction of Jerusalem as symbolized by such language as this. 'Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; and he shall send his angels with the great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.' This language is the exact repetition of descriptions of the scenes of the last judgment given by Christ on other occasions, and therefore must naturally be referred to that event, and not to the destruction of Jerusalem, to which it cannot be made to apply at all, without employing a mode of interpretation which sets both reason and Scripture at defiance. But we are asked, how is it that Christ says, *immediately* after the tribulation of those days (meaning the calamities attending the destruction of Jerusalem) these signs shall take place? This difficulty is dissipated by remembering that the word translated *immediately* frequently has the meaning of suddenly, or unexpectedly, and this is beyond all doubt the signification in this passage, because the sign of the Son of man did not appear in heaven, with the accompaniment of the mourning of all the tribes of the earth when they saw his coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem; and we cannot without the most constrained and absurd interpretation apply these symbols to any events of the period immediately succeeding that catastrophe."—Second Advent, pp. 239–241.

He thus admits that the coming of Christ foretold in the passage, is Christ's second coming, and that if the word ευθεως, translated *immediately*, truly denotes that that coming is closely to follow the events foretold as involved in the Jewish tribulation, then it is indubitably to take place antecedently to the millennium. But ευθεως is indisputably justly rendered by immediately. If it ever has the sense Dr. Berg ascribes to it, the etymologists and lexicographers are not aware of it. The assertion that it may justly be rendered *suddenly*, *unexpectedly*, is a mere pretext. Its only meaning is straightway, forthwith, immediately, in direct connexion with that which is represented as preceding it. Its position, moreover, in the sentence, shows that the immediateness of Christ's coming, is its close connexion with the termination of the Jewish tribulation. If rendered suddenly even, it would still carry that as its leading sense, as it would be unnatural and absurd to represent it as happening suddenly or unexpectedly after an event that had preceded it thousands of years. It is defined also by Mark as to take place in the days after that tribulation, that is, that immediately follow it, as it would be unnatural to define them as having any connexion with that tribulation, if they are to be at the distance of so many ages and centuries from it, and have no other relation to it than such a vast and indefinite distance. What, then, is the period covered by that tribulation? It is exhibited by Luke as concurrent with the times of the Gentiles; that is, the period during which their domination under the sway of the wild beast is to last; and that is, as defined in Daniel ii. and vii. and Rev. xix. 11–21, till Christ's second coming, when he is to destroy that hostile power. By Dr. Berg's concession then, the passage foreshows that Christ's second coming is to precede and usher in the millennium, and overturns the whole of the arguing and declamation by which he attempts to disprove and confound that doctrine.

IV. He attempts to embarrass and overwhelm the doctrine of Christ's reign on the earth by arbitrary and false objections.

1. Such is the pretext that it is disproved by Christ's declaration that his kingdom is not of this world. But that is simply a denial that it is of the same order as the kingdoms of this world; that is, of the same species of authority, of

the same relations between the king and his subjects, of the same interests, of the same laws, of the same kind of power and influence, of the same scope and destiny. It is not a denial that it is to be *in* this world though not of it, nor is it a denial that its king is to rule over it in person, any more than it is a denial that it is to be in this world. So far from it, Christ in that very declaration to Pilate, that his kingdom is not of this world, avowed himself to be the king of the Jews, which was an avowal according to the predictions and promises of the Old Testament respecting the Messiah, that he was to reign over them in this world for ever, Isaiah ix. 7; Jeremiah xxxiii. 14–18. No fancy can be more unwarrantable therefore than that the fact that his kingdom is not *like* the kingdoms of this world, over which mere men reign, and reign in folly and wickedness in the main, and to the ruin of themselves and the oppression and ruin of their subjects, is a proof that it is not in this world, and to be reigned over by him in person.

2. Such is the pretence, that if Christ descends and reigns on the earth, he must undergo a second humiliation like that to which he was subjected at his incarnation.

"I object to this Millenarian theory, because it involves a second humiliation of the exalted Redeemer. I know this earth is the field on which his victories were gained. I can believe that this little spot in the universe is invested with mighty interest. For the suffering of death on Calvary Jesus is crowned with glory and honor. Adoring angels wait and worship around that throne. . . . . Behold him there, a Prince and a Saviour! The heavens are filled with his glory! *Will he lay aside that glory?* The Scriptures answer, Never! 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.' *Will he come down again to dwell upon a sin-cursed world, and with his martyred saints again cast in his lot amid scenes of sin and suffering and death?* For these things are not abolished in the millennial reign. *What, shall he leave the general assembly and church of the first-born in heaven, the innumerable company of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, in order to set up a terrestrial empire for a thousand years?* SHALL HE SUFFER A SECOND HUMILIATION?"—Pp. 35, 36.

Such are the revolting misrepresentations by which he attempts to disgrace the doctrine of Christ's reign on the

earth. Where does he find any authority for his assumption, that if Christ reigns on the earth, he must divest himself of his glory, and suffer a second humiliation like that to which he descended at his incarnation?—that is, that he must return back to the form of a servant and subject, such as he then wore, and submit again to the self-denials and scorn and hatred which he met at his first advent? In what way could Dr. Berg exhibit a more open disregard of the teachings of the Divine word? Christ himself represents, that when he comes the second time, he will appear in power and great glory; that at the moment of his advent the sun itself will be darkened, that the dazzling light in which he is to be clothed may be felt in its full resplendence; and in his acts as Judge he is to sit on a throne of glory; and the prophecies everywhere represent that he is to reign—not as a subject, "despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" but as God-man glorified, the head of the universe and the head of the church, whose aim in receiving the earth as his kingdom, and reigning over it, is to be to redeem it from the dominion of Antichrist and of Satan, and raise it from the sway and curse of sin to holiness and bliss. "When the seventh angel sounded, and great voices in heaven proclaimed, The kingdom of this world is become Christ's, and he shall reign for ever and ever; the four-and-twenty elders which sat before God fell on their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We thank thee, O Lord, the Almighty God, who is, and who was, that thou hast assumed thy great power, and reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead to judge, and give the reward to thy servants the prophets, and the holy, and those who fear thy name, small and great, and to destroy those who destroy the earth," Rev. xi. 15–18. In like manner, at the moment after the destruction of Babylon, when Christ was to descend to raise his dead saints, and enter on his millennial reign, a voice came out of the throne, addressed to the church on earth, and saying, "Praise our God all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great." And an answer went back from our world, "as a voice of a great multitude, and as a voice of many waters, and as a voice of mighty thunders,

saying, Alleluia, that the Lord God Almighty has reigned. Let us rejoice, and exult, and give glory to him; for the marriage of the Lamb has come, and his bride has prepared herself." Such are the sentiments with which the church in heaven and on earth is to contemplate Christ's entrance on his reign in our world: such the utterances of gratitude, adoration, and joy with which they are to celebrate it.

They excite no kindred feeling, it seems, in Dr. Berg's breast. He has no sympathy with them, nor comprehension of them. He has not caught a glimpse, it appears, either of the glory of Christ's person or the ends for which he is to reign. He imagines that if he comes to rescue the race from the thraldom of sin, instead of raising it to a likeness to himself, he will not only leave it essentially what he finds it, but will himself descend to a level with it, and "cast his lot" as though he were a mere human being, "amid its scenes of sin, and of suffering, and of death!"

He is equally regardless of the teachings of the divine word in respect to the reign of the glorified saints with Christ. The Scriptures represent that he is to bring his saints with him, and that they are to sit on thrones, and reign with him during the thousand years. 1 Thess. iv. 14; Zech. xiv. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 23; Rev. xx. 4–6; Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27. Dr. Berg, though on one page asking whether Christ's "martyred saints are to cast in their lot with him amid the scenes of sin, and of suffering, and of death," in our world;—in the next intimates, that if he comes to the earth, he will "leave the general assembly and church of the first-born" in the skies, "the innumerable company of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect;" thus imputing to the doctrine an element which, unless bereft of memory, he should have been aware does not belong to it. He contradicts in an equal measure the representations the Scriptures give of the condition of the earth and the race during the reign of Christ. They announce that God is then to create new heavens and a new earth, and create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy; that he will put his law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be his people; and they shall all know him, from the least of them unto

the greatest, and he will forgive their iniquity, and will remember their sin no more, and that he will wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things will have passed away. Isaiah lxv. 17–25; Jeremiah xxxi. 32, 33; Rev. xxi. 4. Dr. Berg, on the contrary, supposes the earth itself to be as much under the curse—and the race essentially as much the victims of sin, of suffering, and of death, as they are now. That the earth is truly to be created anew, and become a fit residence of the glorified Redeemer and his risen saints; and that its inhabitants are to receive such a transformation of nature, and be raised to such a rank in intelligence, rectitude, purity, and love, as to make them meet to dwell in a world in which he reveals himself, and reigns in his glory, Dr. B. has not the faintest conception. His loftiest ideas of the race, in its millennial state, are scarcely above that of a partially Christianized community of the present day. His beau-ideal, indeed, of the world in that age, it seems from his exposition of the stone and the image (Dan ii. 45), is already realized in such a measure in "the American Republic," that he regards Christ himself, in his prerogatives and glory as the King of kings, as the fit representative of its leaders; the hosts of heaven as appropriate symbols of its armies; and his conquest of the beast and its party as the representative of the victory it is to gain over those antichristian powers! This wretched debasement of views, this sad darkness and bewilderment of mind, it is not in the power of reasoning or remonstrance to correct. It can be wrought only by the Spirit of God.

3. Such is the notion that if Christ comes and reigns on the earth, the renovating influence of the Holy Spirit must cease, and the work of redemption come to an end.

"So soon as the Son of man comes, there is an end of the Spirit's work. He will no longer convince of sin, of righteousness, and of a judgment to come. The day of redemption, to which God's people are sealed, will have come. Henceforth, he that is holy will be holy still, he that is filthy will be filthy still. Sinners will flee in dismay from the presence of their Judge. They will seek a shelter from the wrath of the Lamb, but they will seek in vain, for the work of the Holy

Spirit is done, and the day of vengeance is in the Redeemer's heart.

"This is the consistent declaration of the Scripture. But the Millenarian scheme is utterly at variance with this view. The Son of man is to come, and by his coming he is to inaugurate the millennial era, and to reign in his glorified humanity upon the earth, whilst the Holy Spirit is to carry on the work of redemption.

"Therefore [their theory implies], he will not wait on his throne till his enemies are made his footstool, but he will come on purpose, to subdue them, and so bring the dispensation of the Spirit to a *violent* end."—Pp. 27, 28.

He thus first assumes and asserts that the work of the Spirit is to terminate at Christ's second coming, and then alleges that assumption as a proof that his advent is not to precede the millennium. But where is his proof that the work of the Spirit is to cease at Christ's second coming? He has none. No fancy could be more groundless or in more open conflict with the word of God. God expressly promises in Joel ii. 28–32, that in the great and terrible day of the Lord, which is the day of Christ's coming, he will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh, and the sons and daughters shall prophesy, and the old men shall dream dreams, and the young men shall see visions; and upon the servants and upon the handmaids, in those days he will pour out his Spirit." It is foreshown also in Acts iii. 19–21, that the times of the restitution of all things spoken of by the prophets, when Christ shall descend again from heaven to earth, are to be times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and it is given as a characteristic of that dispensation in distinction from this, that then God will give his people a new heart, and put a new spirit within them; and will take away the stony heart out of their flesh and will give them a heart of flesh: and he will put his Spirit within them, and cause them to walk in his statutes, and they shall keep his judgments and do them, Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27, xxxvii. 14, and xi. 19. What can be more unwarrantable and presumptuous in the presence of these great pledges of the outpouring and continual presence of the Spirit, after Christ comes, than to maintain that his work is then wholly to cease, and the redemption of the race for ever end?

But Dr. Berg's theory is as self-confuting and absurd, as it is contradictious to the teachings of the Scriptures: inasmuch as it implies that, the Spirit exerts no influence on the redeemed after they pass into Christ's presence: For if the Spirit cannot exert his enlightening, quickening, and life-giving power on men, in the presence of Christ in this world, why must it not be equally impossible that he should in heaven? But how, then, is it that the spirits of men who pass from this world in great perverseness, great ignorance, and great sin, the moment they enter the presence of Christ, are raised to a lofty intelligence, perfect rectitude, and perfect love? And how are they sustained and continually advanced in knowledge, holiness, and steadfastness in Christ's service, and are to be advanced to higher and higher spheres in them through eternal ages? Is that the work of second causes? Is it not as indubitably the work of the Spirit, as the illumination, sanctification, and confirmation of believers in holiness in this world are? No considerate person, surely, will venture to advance a different doctrine. The work of the Spirit in the hearts of the redeemed, is undoubtedly to be as continual and unending as the work of Christ is, as their upholder and Ruler. It is exhibited as the peculiarity and glory of their state, that they are to be united to him as their head, and that all, with unveiled face, beholding, as in a mirror, his glory, are to be changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord," 2 Cor. iii. 18. But Dr. Berg appears to have studied the teachings of the Scriptures in regard to the office of the Holy Spirit, with as little care as he has in respect to the work of Christ. Instead of exerting his influences on those only who are absent from the Redeemer, he is to dwell in the glorified in all the greatness and grandeur of his gifts, through their endless being.

4. Of a like nature is the pretence, that the doctrine that the nations are not to be converted till Christ comes, implies that "efforts for the conversion of the world are hopeless."

"If the Millenarian view be correct, all efforts for the conversion of the world are hopeless. If the glorious Saviour is to be revealed from heaven before the day of judgment, and to

establish a theocracy upon earth, if he is personally to set in order a train of means by which the work of salvation is to be more effectually accomplished, then what becomes of the promises which cheer the hearts of God's servants in the midst of discouragements? How shall we reconcile with this idea the great Apostolic commission; 'Go ye into all the world, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and lo; I am with you alway even to the end of the world [age]?' If the Lord Jesus Christ is very soon to come in person and set up his kingdom, and overthrow every opposing power, then certainly all the efforts we can make, however evangelical and earnest, cannot be of much account, because they are not intended to produce material results. If this be so, why speed the missionary to distant lands with the word of salvation? Why multiply translations and copies of the Bible and give the poor savage the bread of heaven? Why labor by day and by night through weary years, to acquire a knowledge of the barbarous languages of the benighted heathen? If Jesus is coming to do the work of evangelization, if this is the plan which the Scripture reveals, then we labor and plough without hope of a harvest, and with no prospect of accomplishing any decisive results. But we have not so learned the gospel."—Pp. 30, 31.

Can it be that Dr. Berg comprehends this argument and is sincere in it? The principle on which he proceeds in it is, that unless it is God's purpose to make the means that are employed for the conversion of men immediately and absolutely efficacious to all with whom they are used, there is no inducement to employ them! Reject that principle and his argument fails. And yet neither Dr. Berg nor any other Antimillenarian who makes any effort to spread the gospel, acts on it. He does not expect that all whom he addresses from Sabbath to Sabbath, are to be converted; nor that one in ten of them are. He does not expect that all those to whom missionaries proclaim the glad tidings of salvation in heathen lands are to be converted, nor one in a hundred of them. Why then does he offer the objection, knowing, as he must, that if legitimate it is as applicable to himself and his party as it is to those whom he opposes; and that he continually contradicts it in his labors as a minister? Why does he offer it, knowing as he must, if he ever casts

a glance at the gospel—that it is in open contradiction to Christ's injunctions? He forewarned his apostles, that instead of meeting universal success in their work, they were to go forth as lambs among wolves, and be rejected, opposed, persecuted, and put to death; that only one out of the several classes of their hearers would believe; that instead of the unobstructed triumph of the truth, and the general conversion of the nations, the church itself was to apostatize to superstition and idol worship; and the faithful witnesses of the word compelled for ages to bury themselves in seclusion to escape the sword of antichrist; and that that war was to continue till his second coming. Yet the knowledge that they were to be but partially successful did not release them from the obligation, nor deprive them of adequate motives to obey the command to preach the gospel. Paul preached, though he knew that the word would be a savor of death to many who heard it; and all his successors have, down to the present age, and will continue to till Christ comes.

His charge is confuted also by the interest and activity Millenarians exhibit in missions. It is well known that in Great Britain and in this country they take at least as earnest a part in the advocacy and support of missions, proportionably to their numbers, as their opponents, and a still larger share in the missions themselves;—a very considerable proportion of the laborers in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Pacific isles being sincere and joyous believers in the premillennial coming and the reign of Christ on the earth. Dr. Berg's objection is no expression of the effect of the doctrine on Millenarians. It is only an utterance of what he imagines its influence would be on himself; and is equivalent to an avowal, that if he did not believe his efforts to spread the gospel are to be attended with instant and absolute success in the conversion of those to whom it is communicated, no matter how imperative the commands of Christ are, he would never lift a finger to make known its glad tidings to the perishing!

Instead of assuming an attitude so irreconcilable with the humbleness, submission, and faith that become a believer, would it not be well for Dr. Berg to reflect whether God may not have other designs in requiring his people to make

known the gospel to the nations, beside their conversion; and designs that leave the obligation of the church to obey his command unimpaired? The question, what is it wisest for God to do, is very different from the question, what is it the duty of men to do? It does not follow from the fact that God does not design to make the gospel efficacious to all to whom it is made known, that it is not man's duty to make it known to all. It is a fact, that God has for ages allowed a vast share of the human family to whom the work of redemption has been revealed, to reject it; and a still greater share to remain ignorant of the method of restoration he has provided from sin and its curse. After the fall, though the mediation of Christ was made known to the first pair and their posterity, and sacrifices instituted to typify him as the sacrifice for sin, the whole race sank to such utter alienation from God, that he swept them, with the exception of a single family, to destruction by a flood. Two or three centuries after that catastrophe, the whole race then dispersed over the earth, apostatized to the worship of false gods, and a large share of their posterity have continued idolaters to the present time. Even the Israelites, to whom he revealed himself anew, and unfolded far more fully the work of redemption, revolted to idolatry, and were, in punishment of their apostasy, carried into captivity, and have remained in exile, and in a great measure in the darkness of paganism for twenty-five centuries. When the Redeemer having come and accomplished the expiation of sin, the glad tidings of salvation through his blood were proclaimed to the Jews and Gentiles of that generation, a large part of those who heard the summons to repentance and faith disregarded it, and perished, as have their successors in every subsequent age. The church itself also, like the Israelites, soon revolted from Christ, to trust in idols and creatures as their saviours, and for ten or twelve centuries, only here and there a small group of individuals or families offered a true worship to God. Since the repromulgation of the gospel at the Reformation, and recreation of a numerous church of evangelical believers, it has again apostatized on a vast scale, and the gospel is at this moment neglected by far the greater part of those to whom it is made known, and by multitudes is utterly rejected as a mere

human fable. And it is foreshown that they are to continue thus to neglect and reject it till Christ's second coming.

God has thus left the greater part of mankind to remain unconverted and perish, notwithstanding the knowledge of his mercy he has communicated to them, and the mighty influence of his providence, his word, and his Spirit, he has employed to impress, restrain, and subdue them. There must therefore be reasons for it of infinite moment. What can they be? We see that a vast and awful demonstration has taken place of three great truths, a knowledge of which is essential to men and to the universe, in order to a just understanding of the power, the grace, and the sovereignty of the work of redemption. First, that mankind are hopelessly alienated from God, and need such a salvation as he gives. Secondly, that no mere instrumental means have any efficiency to bring them to repentance, faith, and love. And thirdly, that notwithstanding the boundless demonstration of those truths, men and the ministry of the church itself are prone to take the work of redemption into their own hands, and arrogate to themselves the credit of saving those who they suppose are converted through their instrumentality. All the false religions that have prevailed in the world have been schemes of redemption that men have devised, and substituted instead of God's; and all the apostasies of the Christian church have been rejections in some form of Christ and his salvation, and substitutions of other saviours and modes of redemption in their place.

Now, should Dr. Berg be able to satisfy himself that the fact that God exercises this sovereign dispensation, is a proof that these demonstrations that take place under it are indispensably necessary, in order that he may carry on the work of redemption compatibly with his glory and the well-being of his unfallen kingdom; may it not be well for him to reflect, whether a like necessity may not exist of the demonstration of those awful truths at the commencement of the millennium, when salvation is to be extended from the narrow limits to which it has hitherto been confined, to the whole living race? And may it not be among the reasons that Christ should come in person, in power, and great glory, and by dispensing in a large degree with human instrumentalities, and destroying the antichristian powers by

his own avenging fires; dashing Satan to the abyss; and striking unbelief and doubt from the hearts of all by the immediate revelation of himself to them, and exertion of acts of judgment and grace in their presence; cut off all pretence that men are the authors or instruments of the redemption he bestows, and hush the lofty boasts and pride of men into eternal silence. Should Dr. Berg reach this natural and obvious conclusion; should he catch a glimpse of the great fact, that one reason that God does not now generally connect the gift of salvation with the knowledge of the gospel, is the almost unconquerable disposition of men to arrogate to themselves the glory that is due to him; and that one reason that Christ is to come in person to redeem the race from its ruin by his own immediate power and the influences of the Spirit, independently in a great measure of human instrumentality, is, that it is essential to his glory that he should confute the arrogations and confound the empty pride of just such ministers of the church as Dr. Berg himself is, who maintain that the world is to be saved only through the agencies of the church, and claim that God is pledged to give efficacy to the means which they employ for that purpose;—possibly his clamors may sink into silence; his hostility to the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign die away; the voice of the divine word which so clearly proclaims it, may attract and gain his ear; and he may at length rise to joy and thanksgiving, that it is in that manner so essential to his own vindication and the well-being of the world, that the Saviour is to take to himself his great power and reign for ever and ever.

V. He resorts to gross misconstructions of passages to support his views. We can refer to only a few.

1. Thus, he represents that the error into which the Thessalonians had fallen in respect to the coming of Christ, was a belief that it was nigh; but that is a mistake. The false doctrine from which Paul endeavored to withdraw them, was, that the day of the Lord had *already arrived.* "Now we beseech you, brethren, in respect to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind nor troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ, ἐνέστηκεν, has come.

Let no man deceive you by any means; for it can not come, except there have come an apostasy first, and the man of sin have been revealed." It was thus the persuasion that the day of Christ had already come, and agitation and grief probably in regard to their friends who had died,—under the apprehension, from there being no signs at their graves of their resurrection, that they had perished,—from which he endeavored to recall them. The declamation with which Dr. Berg fills a long series of pages, is accordingly thrown away. The prophecy, moreover, directly and hopelessly confutes his theory that Christ's advent is not to take place till after the millennium has passed, and the work of redemption reached its close: as the apostle expressly teaches that the apostasy which was to precede Christ's coming, was to continue till the man of sin should arise,—(for the false prophet we are taught, Rev. xix. 20, is to perish with him;) and that the man of sin is to continue till he is destroyed by the brightness of Christ's appearing and consumed by the flaming breath that is to proceed from his mouth. No thousand years therefore are to intervene between the period of the apostasy, and the rise of the man of sin; and thence

showing himself, that he is God; whose coming or presence is according to the working of Satan in all power, and signs, and wonders of falsehood, and in all deceit of unrighteousness toward them that are being destroyed, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved; and for that, God shall send them an energy of deceit, so that they shall believe the lie, that they all may be condemned, who believe not the truth, but are pleased with unrighteousness. Such is Dr. Berg's beau-ideal of the millennium, the beauty and glory of which he is apprehensive would be wholly eclipsed and extinguished by the personal presence and reign of the Son of God! Did infatuation ever plunge into a deeper abyss of error and extravagance! But no constructions are too arbitrary or revolting to be resorted to by Dr. Berg, when necessary to shield his theories from confutation, and give them a color of authority from the divine word.

As he holds that the Man of sin, and son of perdition, is to subsist and flourish through the millennium, so his construction of the prediction, Isaiah ii. 2, 3, implies that the church is, during that period, to be nationalized, or made the state church by the Man of sin and all other civil rulers, and is to be to them in that relation, what Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, is to be to the wild beast from the abyss in the last stage of her career, when she is to be drunk with the blood of the saints, and is to intoxicate the nations with the cup of her profligacy.

"It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills and all nations shall flow unto it. In the symbolic language of prophecy, 'a mountain' denotes a state, or kingdom. The mountain of Moab, is the kingdom of Moab. The mountain of Samaria, is the state or kingdom of Samaria. 'The mountain of the Lord's house is therefore the kingdom of the Lord's house.' The Lord's house, or the house of the Lord, is commonly used in the prophetic language of the Bible, and even in that diction which is not prophetic, as symbolising the church of God. So Paul giving directions to Timothy says, 'That thou mayest know how to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God.' And again in his epistle to the Hebrews, he speaks of Christ as a son

over his own house, whose house are we. 'The mountain of the Lord's house' is therefore the kingdom of the church of Christ on the earth . . . . Now the prophet declares the divine decree that this kingdom of Christ, in its spiritual supremacy, shall be established in the top of the mountains, or kingdoms of the earth, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. This evidently portrays the triumph of those principles of righteousness which Jesus Christ has proclaimed, and which shall be established in the earth. The doctrines of eternal truth and righteousness, of peace and love and good will to men, shall be exalted to the very top of the mountains, controlling the conduct and administration of political governments."—Pp. 115, 116.

In the first place, his construction of the term mountain in the passage is wholly unauthorized and subversive of the prediction. He treats the prophecy as though it were symbolic like the visions of Daniel and John, and makes the objects and agents in it merely representative of others of an analogous nature. But that is to misconceive it, and convert it into a complication of self-contradictions. If the house on the top of the mountains represents the church, and the church, as Dr. B. holds, comprises all the rulers and nations of the earth, what can be meant by the many people saying, Let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob? If they are all already members of that church, what is signified by their going to it, as though it were a place at a distance, which they had never yet visited? What is the distinction between the mountain and the house that is established on it? Is "the kingdom of the church" a political organization, and a different body from the church itself? If the "kingdom of the church" is a political organization sustaining the church, what is meant by the establishment of that political organization in the top of the other political kingdoms or organizations of the world? Into what more inextricable confusion could Dr. Berg have fallen? But the prophecy is not symbolic. It is a language prophecy, and is to be interpreted by the laws of philology. Dr. Berg mistakes its nature as grossly as he would mistake the nature of the Apocalypse, if he were to treat that as unsymbolic, and to be interpreted by the mere laws of grammar.

In the next place, "a mountain" does not "denote a state or kingdom," "in the symbolic language of prophecy." There is no "symbolic *language* of prophecy." Symbols are agents, objects, acts, effects, not words by which they are named, or expressions by which they are described. Nor do mountains, when used as symbols, denote states or kingdoms. The only instances in which they are used as symbols are Rev. vi. 13, xvi. 20, and xvii. 9, and in those cases they denote the combination of rulers who exercise the government of a state or kingdom, not the state itself; as a mountain is a part of the earth that is largely elevated above the lower portions that surround it. In Rev. xvii. 9, the seven mountains are interpreted as symbolizing, like the seven heads of the beast, the seven series of magistrates or rulers who had swayed and were to sway the Roman empire. In the unsymbolic prophecies, the term mountain not only is not generally used in the sense of a state or kingdom, but there is not an instance in which it can be shown to have that meaning. Dr. Berg attempts to verify his construction by alleging that "the mountain of Moab is the kingdom of Moab." Awkwardly for him, however, no such expression occurs either in the prophetic or the unprophetic Scriptures. Nor is "the mountain of Samaria" used with that meaning. It occurs but thrice and in each instance in its literal sense to denote the mountain or hill on which Samaria was situated, 1 Kings xvi. 24. Thus, Amos iii. 9, it is used in a summons to the princes of Ashdod and Egypt "to assemble themselves upon the mountains of Samaria, to behold the great tumults in the midst thereof, and the oppression in the midst thereof." That is, they were summoned to ascend Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim, and look down from their heights on the city beneath, observe the tumults with which it was agitated, and the crimes of which its rulers and people were guilty, in order to be incited to interpose and punish them. So also Amos iv. 1, "Hear this word ye kine [cows] of Bashan that are in the mountain of Samaria, who oppress the poor, who crush the needy, who say to their masters, Bring and let us drink." They who are here addressed are human beings, and the rich and powerful matrons of Samaria, manifestly from their being described as oppressing the poor and crushing the needy. They are called "cows

of Bashan" to denote their unwomanly tastes and manners —the cattle of that district being distinguished for fierceness. They are said to be in "the mountain of Samaria" simply to denote that they were residents in the capital. It were absurd to exhibit kine as in the government of a kingdom instead of its territory; or women as oppressing and crushing the poor and needy of a government, instead of the poor and needy of the territory of a government. Governments are not the subjects of oppression, but the people that live within their jurisdictions. In Amos vi. 1, "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion, and that rest secure on the mountain of Samaria;" the mountain of Samaria is used as the capital of Ephraim; in the same manner as Zion is as the capital of Judah. The construction Dr. Berg places on the term is thus wholly mistaken.

It is as antichristian also as it is inconsistent with philology. For if the Lord's house denotes the church, the mountain on which it is to be established a political government or state, and the mountains on which that mountain stands, a group of other political governments, what can that establishment of the church be, but its nationalization by the civil states of the world? But that is impossible, inasmuch as the legal establishment of Christianity by a state involves an arrogation of authority over it, and proceeds on the assumption that the right of the subject to profess it, and offer the worship it enjoins, must be derived from the state, and may be denied him, if the state pleases. But that is to arrogate supreme authority over God's subjects in their immediate relations to him and over his laws, and claim the power of abrogating his appointments and releasing his creatures from their allegiance to him—the very crime which the powers denoted by the wild beast have committed in legalizing the Catholic and other churches, and persecuting those who refused submission to their usurped authority; and the crime also the Man of sin and Son of perdition is to commit, when he exalts himself above all that is called God, and that is worshipped, and claims the homage that is due only to the Most High. Such is the climax in which Dr. Berg's expositions issue. Whether he interprets Isaiah, Daniel, Paul, or John, he makes a usurping political state, a nationalized and therefore an apostate

church, and the Man of sin, the dominant powers in the millennium, in much the same shape as they are in the period that precedes the thousand years.

3. He holds that the contest in which the witnesses are to be slain, is to be a contest for political and religious *liberty*, rather than for the truths of the word:

"We have heretofore been disposed to regard the true witnesses as the type of a competent number of faithful preachers of the gospel, or the standing ministry of the true church of the Lord Jesus, composed of believers of all Christian denominations. This view, however, admits of more accurate development. That this idea is contained in the symbol cannot be denied; but it is probably in the fact that Christ's true ministers are *the advocates of civil and religious liberty* that *the pith* of the interpretation of this difficult passage is to be found. The slaying of the witnesses is then symbolic of the overthrow of civil and religious liberty accompanied, no doubt, by the slaughter of its defenders. This view accords with the descriptive details of the prophecy in the Revelation xi. 5–6."—P. 97.

Into what greater error could he fall? The witnesses of God are everywhere defined in the New Testament as the witnesses of the *word* of God and of Jesus, Rev. xx. 4, and represented as slain for the testimony of Jesus; that is, because of their proclaiming the rights and prerogatives of Christ and the doctrines of his salvation, Rev. vi. 9. And they are exhibited in the passage in which their martyrdom is foreshown, as prophesying and uttering a testimony for God. Christ, moreover, expressly enjoined his disciples to submit—in the mere sphere of politics or civil liberty—to the rulers under whom they happened to be placed; and forewarned them that if, as his followers, they took the sword to defend themselves, they would perish by the sword. And Paul taught that even those who were in bondage should remain content in that condition, unless freedom were offered them, and serve their masters with cheerfulness and fidelity. On the other hand, a contest for civil and religious liberty, is not necessarily a contest at all for the word of God, but simply for exemption from compulsion by the state in reference to religion; whether it be compulsion to profess the Christian religion in its purity and observe its

rites, or to reject it, and profess a false system like that of Romanism, or Judaism, Mahommedanism, or Paganism. Accordingly wherever perfect civil and religious liberty is enjoyed, as in this country and the empire of Great Britain, the Atheist, the Pantheist, the Deist, the Pagan, the Mahommedan, the Catholic, and every other false sect have as perfect liberty to cherish, profess, and propagate their several doctrines as the pure believers in the word of God. If the present contest, for example, for civil and religious liberty in Italy proves successful, the effect will be that all legal restraints will be removed from infidelity and atheism as absolutely as from the belief and profession of the doctrines of the gospel and the pure worship of God.

Dr. Berg's construction thus implies that the witnesses, though ministers of the gospel, are to act in the mere sphere of politicians, from which they are expressly prohibited by Christ, and thence that their martyrdom is to result from their stepping out of their office and violating the divine word, instead of proclaiming it! Their resurrection and assumption to heaven would accordingly be a divine sanction and reward of rebellion instead of obedience! What a delightful harmony subsists between this representation that his witnesses, in their conflict with Antichrist, testify and die merely as political prophets, and receive their crowns as martyrs solely for their labors in that relation; and the doctrine for which Dr. Berg so strenuously contends, that Christ's is not in any sense a political or worldly kingdom!

4. He runs into equal contradictions and absurdities in his interpretation of the resurrection foreshown, Rev. xx. 4–16.

"What are we to understand by the *souls* of the martyrs, who live and reign with Christ a thousand years, and whose revival from the dead is spoken of as the first resurrection? At this very point those who contend for the literal rendering are most flagrantly recreant to their principles. They invariably represent this resurrection as though it were a resurrection of the *bodies* of the saints, but that word *body* is not in the record. Read and you will find it is a resurrection of *souls*. And (I saw) the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus. . . . . It is therefore a resurrection of *souls*, and the very language implies its symbolic character. Literally it cannot be re-

ceived without violence to the entire analogy of Scripture; *for the resurrection of a soul would imply that the soul had been asleep or dead in the period preceding its revival.* This we know is not the doctrine of the Scriptures."—Pp. 139, 140.

And he maintains that the meaning of the vision is that God will "in the millennium raise up *men* animated with the souls of the martyrs," p. 146.

But in the first place, he is wholly in error in affirming that the resurrection depicted in the vision, is a mere resurrection of souls, not of bodies. On the supposition that the term souls is used to denote the disembodied spirits of the dead, it presents no ground for that construction. It will only indicate, what doubtless was the fact, that the prophet saw the souls in their disembodied state, immediately before their reunion with their risen bodies; and accordingly witnessed their resurrection or the change that took place at that moment. We have but to arrange the narrative in the order the events naturally occurred, and this will be obvious. "And (I saw) the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, and who had not worshipped the beast nor its image, neither had received its mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived; and I saw thrones, and they sat on them, and judgment was given to them, and they reigned with Christ a thousand years." It is thus entirely consistent with the narrative to suppose that the apostle first saw the souls in their disembodied state; then witnessed their reunion to their bodies by the resurrection of the latter from the grave: next, beheld the thrones, and lastly saw the risen and glorified saints seated on them, invested with judicial authority and reigning with Christ.

On the supposition, however, that the spectacle which the apostle witnessed, was a literal resurrection of the bodies of the saints, there is nothing unnatural in his denominating them souls, and affirming that they lived and reigned; inasmuch as the soul, by its reunion to the body, without which the resurrection of the body to life could not take place, shares in the resurrection as truly as the body itself does. It is a usage of the Scriptures, in respect to the resurrection, to denominate the whole being by a part of it. Thus, while

the sleep of death is predicated exclusively of the body, it yet is said that "those that sleep in Jesus will God *bring with him;*" where by the sleepers is meant the souls of those whose *bodies* sleep in Jesus; and they again are described as "the dead in Christ," and it is affirmed that they the sleepers in Jesus, shall not follow the living in their change, but precede them, 1 Thess. iv. 14–16. The terms "they that sleep in Jesus," thus denote in one case their spirits that are to come with Christ from the skies, in another their bodies, and in a third, both, as they will be restored to each other by the reorganization and revivification of the body.

The event of which the martyrs and others were the subjects, is defined, moreover, as a resurrection from death, by the terms themselves, "the resurrection the first," which are given as the description of the event; by their discrimination from the rest of the dead, and by the affirmation that they lived. As it was a return from bodily death to life, it must have been a corporeal resurrection. Dr. Berg is thus wholly mistaken in asserting that souls alone were beheld in the vision, and that they alone were the subjects of the event denominated "the resurrection."

In the next place, his construction is irreconcilable with the nature of the soul, and involves him in inextricable contradictions and absurdities.

The supposition that mere souls were subjects of a resurrection, or return to life, would, Dr. Berg admits, imply that they had been dead in the period that preceded their revival. But that, he grants, is in contradiction to the teachings of the Scriptures. By his own showing, therefore, it confutes his construction of the vision. For there is no other change predicated of the souls, but that they lived, and were the subjects of what is declared to be "the resurrection the first." If they did not undergo a resurrection from death, they did not undergo any change in their state, and nothing was seen by the apostle that could be predicated of them as in any sense a return to life. If, moreover, as Dr. Berg's interpretation implies, they were mere dead souls, and the change through which they passed in the vision, was a mere return to consciousness and activity as souls, then, if they are symbols of souls in this world, the

souls whom they represent must also be disembodied souls and souls that are dead; and the change which their return to life as mere souls symbolizes, must likewise be a mere return of the dead souls which they represent to a conscious life as souls. It is against the laws of symbols and against the assumptions on which Dr. Berg proceeds, that mere souls should symbolize men in their whole nature—soul and body. But that again, as Dr. Berg admits, is both against the nature of the soul, and the clear teachings of the Scriptures. The souls cannot possibly therefore represent, as he imagines, "men" in the material life, "that are animated with the souls of the martyrs." His construction accordingly is again overthrown. And finally, the supposition that men are, during the millennium, to be animated with the spirit of the martyrs, implies that they are to exhibit the same fidelity and courage in proclaiming the truth; and that implies that they are to be under the dominion of rulers who usurp supreme authority over religion in the same manner as the powers denoted by the wild beast have usurped it, and that they are to be assailed by similar persecution, and put in the same manner to death. And that again implies that antichrist is to be in the supremacy as absolutely during the millennium as he is at the present time, and is then to drench the earth as largely with the blood of the saints as he has in the ages of his past career!

Such is the picture Dr. Berg draws from the prophecies of the condition of the race during the thousand years of the kingdom of the saints. In his eagerness to expunge from it the coming reign of Christ, he turns each of the great predictions of his advent and sway into a prophecy of the continuance of the powers symbolized by the wild beast, the man of sin, and Babylon the great, during the millennial age, and the unmitigated persecution and slaughter of the true worshippers throughout that period; and this out of a horror of a worldly kingdom, and love of one that is purely spiritual!

We might point out many other errors in Dr. Berg's volume, but we are weary of the task, and these sufficiently show his disqualification for the discussion of the subjects he affects to treat so confidently, and the quackery and senselessness of his tirades against the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign. We cannot suppose that even antimille-

narians generally can regard him as a friend to their cause. Were it his aim, he could scarcely take a course better adapted to disgrace it. The more he writes, the more he will obstruct and disgust his own party. With all their difficulties on the subject, the enlightened and considerate among them, are not yet prepared, for the sake of getting rid of Christ's personal reign, to give up their expectation of a reign of righteousness and peace, and accept in its place Dr. Berg's beau-ideal of a ransomed world—a millennium in which Antichrist is still to have the supreme sway; the church derive her creed, her worship, and her authority from the state; the witnesses of Jesus be persecuted; and the Man of sin and Son of perdition sit in the temple of God, and claim the attributes, and prerogatives, and worship of the Almighty!

> Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
> Tempus egit;

We want no such advocates, they will exclaim! We want no such partisans. That is the millennium of Antichrist! That is the very triumph which Satan is endeavoring to gain!

Art. IV.—Has the Divine Authority of the Bible been established irrespective of the Facts of Science or the Opinions of Men relative to Moral Truth?

BY REV. HIRAM CARLETON.

Inquiries and Suggestions in regard to the Foundation of Faith in the Word of God. By Rev. Albert Barnes.

"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." There can be no doubt that Mr. Barnes considers the positions which he attempted to defend, in his book with the title named above, absolutely incontrovertible, and that no evil consequences will follow from proceeding upon them in deter-

mining the question whether God has given us a revelation in the writings of the Old and New Testaments. He thinks his main propositions are self-evident; and furthermore, it is certainly to be believed that he did not intend to lead the reader imperceptibly from what he regarded fixed and certain, to that which is of questionable authority. Yet we think his method of treating his subject is fundamentally wrong; that it abuses the reason of man, and leads to habitual doubting, and confirmed distrust in the inspiration of the Scriptures.

We shall use our utmost endeavors to give a fair statement of our author's principles, as laid down in his book; and we hope to be so successful in this, that he will not complain that we do him injustice. We cannot, of course, give at length the arguments by which he attempts to defend his theses; nor would he think this would be rightly required of us.

His main position, from which his discussion proceeds, is, that a pretended revelation which should contradict any established truth could not be received by mankind. By established truth, he seems to mean facts well ascertained and known. Throughout the discussion he manifests a willingness to distinguish between fact and theory, and what is certainly known and mere conjecture. It is true that we think he has himself confounded a knowledge of facts with theories adopted for the purpose of explaining or accounting for the existence of those facts. We also think he assumes the existence of moral facts without proof or the common consent of mankind. These things will receive attention in their proper place. It is due to him that we first examine his groundwork. We shall refer to his own statements.

"*A pretended revelation which should contradict established truth could not be received by mankind.* This is too plain to admit of demonstration. Two opposite statements could not both be received as true. No conceivable evidence in favor of a revelation could be *stronger* than the conviction of the mind that two and two make four, or that all the angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles; in other words, it is impossible for the mind to conceive that the evidence in favor of a revelation *could* be so strong as to set these truths aside. The mind

must believe them. That mind is not in a sound state which does *not* believe them."

. . . . . "If faith in a professed revelation is demanded, it is right to require that its statements shall be fairly *consistent* with all the ascertained facts of science."—P. 26.

Our author here, as elsewhere in his explanation, insists that the facts of science shall be clearly ascertained. He says:

"It is equally proper to demand, on the other hand, if there is an alleged conflict between the statements of the book and the truths of science, that the facts of science shall be clearly established."

. . . . . "The friends of such a revelation have a right to go into the fullest examination of those points, and to demand such evidence of the truth of the alleged facts as shall be sufficient to neutralize all that is urged in behalf of the proposed revelation, or such as shall demonstrate that the alleged facts cannot possibly be otherwise than they are affirmed to be."—P. 27.

A further illustration of the main position of the book may be found in the following extracts:

"A revelation will not, in its teachings, violate the constitutional principles of our nature."—P. 30.

. . . . . "The remark which is here made is, that a revelation will not do violence to the nature of man, as thus explained. It will be in accordance with the original constitution of our minds; it will be such as will commend itself to the just principles of nature; it will be such as the conscience, under the highest teachings and in the most perfect state, will approve; it will be such as will commend itself to the moral sense of mankind, when that moral sense is developed in the best and most perfect forms; it will contain nothing which will be contradictory to either of these things; and if a pretended revelation *did* contain that which was a contradiction of these things, it could not be embraced by mankind."—P. 34.

To illustrate this position the following specification is given:

"Thus, if in a book professing to be a revelation from God,

a command were found to treat our children with neglect, such a command would be a clear demonstration that the book containing it *could* not be from God, and the race could not be bound to receive it."—P. 35.

It may be proper to state here, that while our author distinguishes between "original nature or constitution" and that which man has in his fallen state, yet he speaks of men generally, and not of those who have been regenerated, and claims for all an ability to apprehend clearly and with certainty moral truth. His langnage is:

"There are accurate deductions of reason; there are just convictions of conscience; there is a moral sense which approves of what is right, and which disapproves of what is wrong. There is a perception of what is right in the relations of life; in the duties which men owe to their fellow-men, in the duties which they owe to their Maker. There are things which all men see to be right, and there are things which all men see to be wrong." —P. 33.

This power of making moral distinctions, according to Mr. Barnes, is independent of, or is anterior to, any light from revelation.

He says, on page 81: "The meaning of this proposition is, that the Bible presumes that there is a conscience in man, or that he is endowed with a capacity of judging of right and wrong. It is further meant, that this power of judging, so far, at least, as to be a proper ground of appeal, lies back of the direct teachings of revelation, and that whatever revelation may do to enlarge or correct the power of judging, it presumes that it, in fact, exists in the mind of man." He also claims for this moral constitution an inherent energy and integrity, in consequence of which it will resist the worst developments of human depravity. Speaking of a law "engraved in the hearts of all men, which requires us to love our children," as a specification under his general statement—he says:

"And however much savage tribes may for a time depart from that law, and whatever customs may spring up in the world that infringe on this principle, the original law will ultimately claim to be heard; that law will assert its dominion, and

society will oscillate back to its true position—as, in the movements of the heavenly bodies, if there seems to be, even for the longest series of years, a departure from some great law which threatens ultimately universal ruin, the heavenly bodies will swing back again to their former position, and the universe will right itself again. So in society. . . . . The very necessities of our nature demand this; and men cannot proceed far in their disregard of the law without infringing on a great original principle of nature which réasserts its power, and restores the balance again, and brings the movements of society into harmony with the will of God."—Pp. 35, 36.

We have thus endeavored to give what Mr. Barnes regards as the fundamental principle in his discussion. If in these extracts we have not presented all that he might wish to have transcribed, we trust that in what we shall say, he will have no reason to complain that we do not refer to his position, and to that only. We are certainly willing to meet the question fairly.

We shall, for the sake of convenience and perspicuity, arrange the assumed facts of our author in two classes. In the first we shall place the facts of science. There is an important difference between facts in mathematics and the facts of natural science, and when made the starting point of an argument respecting the ground of faith in revelation, as in the book before us, it should not be forgotten that this difference is something more than a difference in degree. It is general. The mind perceives all that is affirmed in a mathematical proposition. The affirmation has relation to what is unchangeable, independent in itself; neither the product of generation nor subject to decay. It had no cause, no beginning, and can have no destruction. In the natural sciences substances are the objects of knowledge. These substances are subject to change. They undergo what the ancients called generations and corruptions. Hence their present mode of existence, and their existence itself, is supposed to have a cause. Again: scientific men in calling some substances simple, do not wish to be understood to affirm that they are so in fact, but only so far as the present power of analysis can test them. This is true of inanimate matter. In those sciences which relate to vegetables and animals, the subjects of knowledge are far more complex,

consequently there is not a little difficulty in keeping well-known facts distinct from various theories which relate to origin and changes and unexplained properties. We are, however, disposed to arrange mathematical truths and the facts constituting natural sciences, such as are clearly established, in one class.

In the second division we shall place our author's assumed or supposed moral facts established independent of the direct teaching of a revelation. As we are not prepared to concede what he affirms respecting the ability of man, by the aid of reason and moral sense, independent of revelation, to discover moral truth, and of a natural moral constitution, which, by its own energy "oscillates back" into its true position whenever it has been, from any cause, disturbed, we shall reserve so much of his argument as is based upon this assumption to be considered under a separate division.

I. We object to Mr. Barnes's position respecting the foundation of faith in the word of God, that "science is an element in judging of a revelation," for reasons which will now be given.

1. If there is positive proof that the Bible is the word of God, independent of the teachings of science, it were an abuse of reason to affirm that "the unbeliever undoubtedly has a right to *demand* that the statements in the Bible should be shown, by fair interpretation, to be in accordance with all the disclosures of science; and if that cannot be done, that the claims of the Bible should be abandoned." (p. 116.)

If we should say that if it should be found that the proposition that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, contradicts the facts of geological science, it must be regarded as a false statement: is it not probable that our declaration would be received with derision? And should we attempt to make this statement the basis of an argument, setting forth the true foundation of faith in geometry, is it probable that any publisher would be willing to print our treatise on his own responsibility? Geometry, and indeed all true sciences, are established on the fundamental principle that, what has been found to be true must not be doubted. The reason of man will not long retain its integrity if its certain decisions are disregarded, and a habit

of doubting what has been proved is indulged. Let a person yield to the impulse of fear against reason, and it were vain to hope to rescue him from his apprehensions, indulged against reason by any presentation of reasons. An army of men frightened by some trifling noise, so that they flee from their camp, must be permitted to run till they exhaust themselves, or hide behind mullen stalks, or in a thicket of thistles. If a man by any means persuades himself that he has not done, what from important considerations should not have been omitted (provided he did do it faithfully and with due care), and from fearfulness examines his work once, he will do it again and again. Certainty cannot be trifled with without injury to the reason of man. To doubt against absolute proof divests a person of all confidence in his own judgment, and it may be said of him that he will credit the most ridiculous stories while he doubts the most certain and important facts. The skeptic who disbelieves in the miracles of Christ is the very man to believe in modern table-tipping.

Should it be supposed that such positive proof of the inspiration of the Bible does not exist—we would say that it does exist, if its declarations are to be credited. When Christ said "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead," he certainly could not have included the "disclosures of modern science" as an element of the proof of the Divine inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures. There is no allusion to the disclosures of science in the following passage:—"But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him; that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" Nor does it seem to have been anticipated when the apostles went forth preaching the word and working miracles in the name of Christ, that men should learn the relations of what was taught to the facts of science, before they could believe, notwithstanding our Saviour affirmed, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

We doubt not that Mr. Barnes will say that he had no intention to express or justify an opinion that there is not

positive evidence that the Bible is the word of God, or to affirm that that evidence may be doubted in the least degree. We believe that he has the most certain conviction that there is a perfect agreement between the facts of science and the statements of the sacred Scriptures. He must therefore concede the justness of our position; for speaking of certain mathematical facts, he says—"the mind must believe them. That mind is not in a sound state which does not believe them." If, therefore, there be, as the Scriptures affirm, absolute and obvious proof of their Divine inspiration, and this proof is independent of the deductions of science, and has been appreciated by men, and even children, who know little or nothing of science; then to adopt an hypothesis as the basis of a discussion of the "foundation of faith in God's word," which allows, that under certain contingencies, the Divine inspiration of the Bible must be given up, is not only absurd, but it places the mind in a dangerous position, which it cannot accept for the least point of time and remain "in a sound state." "Can a man take fire in his bosom and not be burned?" And can a man admit, even as a supposition, the non-existence of a fact, known to be a fact with absolute certainty, without at least a partial unsoundness of mind? And would it be singular if from this position he should at length disbelieve what could not be called in question, while the mind remains sound?

2. We object to our author's method of discussing the "foundation of faith in God's word," because it implies that the proof of the Divine inspiration of the Bible is not absolute, and consequently leads to a confirmed conviction that certainty of such an inspiration is impossible.

We think it cannot be denied that this is a fair inference of statements often made in the book now under consideration. If the Divine authority of the Bible is made certain by proof which is as obvious as it is conclusive, then to deny it argues unsoundness of mind. And there could be no conceivable occasion for instituting a supposition that, under certain circumstances, it must be denied, for we know beforehand that in no way can it be placed in doubt by true processes of reasoning or by a comparison with other known facts. We do not contrast two facts positively known as

Mr. Barnes contrasts, in his discussion, revelation and the facts of science. We never affirm that we could not believe one statement if it should be found to contradict another statement, excepting when we would declare that one statement we know to be true, but we are not certain about the truth of the other. This form of proposition does necessarily awaken in the mind a conviction that the proof of one of the statements is not positive. It may be said that by this method of discussing the subject Mr. Barnes would hope to dissipate the doubts which men do entertain respecting the divine authority of the Bible. But this will be found to be a vain hope, provided these doubts arise against the most positive proofs, the clearest deductions of reason. If the right to doubt under such circumstances is admitted, doubts are by that act confirmed. A sound mind, according to our author, would say of a fact that wanted not proof, *it cannot, it must not be doubted.* Its denial is impossible. On the other hand, it may be urged that, according to this position, all who have doubts respecting the inspiration of the Scriptures are afflicted with an unsound mind. This we admit, and is just the thing that we intend to affirm and substantiate. We are of the opinion that no fact was ever presented to the mind of man more obvious than that the Bible is the word of God, and that this fact is doubted only because men are deranged in their moral nature so that they are destitute of true faith in God and love to his excellent glory. We wish to affirm that, in our opinion, men would see with the utmost certainty the work of God in the Bible, were it not that the depravity, disease, death of the moral nature overpowers the reason so that its perceptions are indistinct and uncertain, its deductions are confused in respect to Divine things. If this position be true (and if the Bible be true it must be so) then to treat the doubts of men respecting the inspiration of that Book as if they were caused by a lack of certain evidence, or because of apparent contradiction between its statements and other known facts; and attempt to remove these doubts by proving that these apparent contradictions are not real, is most miserable quackery, and can never remove the disease, but will aggravate it. But the discussion of Mr. Barnes contemplates intellectual doubts, carefully distinguished from the effects of

moral depravity. It assumes something in men universal, unimpaired by moral causes, a power of judging necessarily inherent in the rational soul. The doubts contemplated are purely intellectual in themselves, and their causes, and his method of removing them is also purely intellectual and is applicable to the depraved as well as to the renewed mind. Nowhere does he affirm directly a defect in the positive proof of Divine inspiration. Nor does he anywhere suggest that doubts may be removed by a clearer exhibition of this proof. The doubts he deals with are those which arise from an apparent conflict between known facts and the Bible; doubts which could not exist on the supposition that it has been proved to be true by positive evidence, any more than we can by any means be persuaded to doubt that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles. Starting with a truism "that one truth cannot contradict another," which could not be applied to the consideration of the proof of an assumed fact by comparing it with a fact fully established, without implicitly involving a doubt respecting the existence of the fact assumed, he uses language which would imply that the discoveries of science had thrown the Divine authority of the Bible into very serious doubt. Nay more, he proceeds in his discussion, as might have been supposed, to put the question of inspiration on the defensive, and to constitute a showing of a harmony between the Bible and science an integral element in the evidence by which alone its claim to be the word of God can be established. Accordingly he says, "Perhaps a more essential service, therefore, could not be rendered to the cause of truth than by the inquiry whether the Bible, according to the principles laid down in the previous chapters, does commend itself to the world as being in accordance with the ascertained facts of science, with the fundamental laws of our nature, and with the convictions in regard to right and wrong which God has enstamped upon the human soul," p. 64. The reason why this inquiry is, in his opinion, of such momentous consequence may be found in the following statement. "If the book now received by the Christian world as a revelation from God is to retain the hold which it now has on the human mind, and is ultimately to obtain a universal belief among mankind that it is from God, it

must be shown that it meets the demands implied in these principles," p. 63. Alas for the faith of past generations of Christians! They supposed they believed in God, but had they lived in the present age how would the evidence by which they persuaded themselves that the Bible is certainly the word of God have vanished, like the dew-drops before the rising sun! And yet we may say blessed ignorance! Had they lived long enough to become acquainted with the disclosures of modern science, and yet not long enough to reconcile all the statements of the Bible with them, how miserable must they have been to have been aroused to the consciousness that they had been trusting to evidence of Divine inspiration, which wanted a very essential element to make it complete and certain. And then their sun, which set in glory, would have gone down amidst storms and tempests so fearful as to make even the beholders quake! But the difficulty, as stated by our author, is still more alarming. After speaking of this form of inquiry as large and the most important to the world, involving "all the historical statements, all the statements on the subject of morals, and all the statements that have a bearing on the subjects of science to be found in the Bible," he says, "few men would be found competent for such an examination." And again he says, "the world has not yet furnished the man that is qualified for this," p. 64.

We trust that we have shown that we were justified in our statement, that the method of Mr. Barnes implies "that the proof of the Divine inspiration of the Bible is not absolute; for if we have failed to show this by any reasons presented under this head, his own confession, into which he seems to have been led in defence of his own position, as he understood it, confirms it in terms stronger than we should have been willing to use. It is painful to know that our author considers that the discoveries of science and progress in morals, and in knowledge of history, have involved the proof of the inspiration of the Bible in so many doubts that there has not arisen a man competent to dispel them. And yet we apprehend that this is the natural consequence of basing an argument on the hypothesis that the Bible cannot be the word of God if it contradict known facts, when, from the very nature of the case, the proof that it is the

word of God must, if it exist at all, be positive, and consequently not admitting of a negation.

3. If the positions of Mr. Barnes are true, the time will never arrive when mankind will receive the Bible as the word of God.

According to his own representation there never has been a man competent to harmonize its statements with all the facts otherwise known. There still remain, in his view, apparent difficulties, notwithstanding many supposed contradictions have been shown to be only in appearance, while men had only a partial knowledge of the facts. Other questions have arisen which need solution. We see not how a fixed and certain conclusion can be arrived at until men shall attain unto all possible knowledge of science. And our author says, "A revelation from God will be consistent with the discoveries of science in its highest developments or its ultimate attainments," p. 56. When will this perfection in knowledge be realized?

Mr. Barnes seems to have been a little disturbed lest there should be no end to fearful apprehensions respecting the truth of the Bible, and gives a word of encouragement. He says, "The believer in the Bible has nothing to fear. The just foundation of faith in the word of God has not thus far been shaken. From this point it seems to be proper that the believer in the book should look onward without apprehensions of the future," p. 179. Why so? Is it certain that this wonderful generation knows nearly all that can be known? And if there is ground for so much consolation, perhaps, after all, the labor of that wonderful man, who could reconcile the statements of the Bible with facts otherwise known, could be dispensed with!

There is another suggestion connected with this discussion which we will introduce in this place. If the theory of Mr. Barnes is a true theory, then we say there can be no good reason for rejecting it. But if it be an error, it certainly is a very dangerous error. It is dangerous for these reasons.

1. Though most men, when they have certain knowledge, know it, yet there are only a few men who know how to distinguish between absolute knowledge and possibility or probability.

2. Those persons who regard little the laws of evidence are generally the most positive in asserting their opinions.

3. We are all more or less liable to imagine that we have certain knowledge where we are miserably deceived.

Hence if the position be adopted that the Bible must be abandoned when it should be found to contradict known fact, very many, not distinguishing between truth and their favorite errors, between fact and theories, will be ready to cast suspicion upon the inspiration of the Scriptures, because they contradict their favorite opinions; and we shall take the liberty to suggest, and we do it with profound respect for his candor and piety, that our author has assumed as demonstrated fact what lacks very many elements of demonstration, and consequently is nothing but theory; and affirms that if the common interpretation be sustained, by which the Bible is made to contradict this assumed demonstrated fact, it cannot be the word of God. He says, "these are indeed facts in regard to science [of geology] as clearly determined as any facts in any other established science, these are facts entirely at variance with the views held for-

seem to indicate that such causes have existed, and from thence construct a theory for explaining the gradual formation of the earth's crust, for this would be building theory upon theory.

4. If this should be allowed, yet no explanation has been given of the gradual formation of the crust of the earth according to the proofs proposed, which is not involved in inextricable difficulties.

5. No person can deny that God may have made the crust of the earth at the first very nearly in its present form. Again, it cannot be denied that He may have made it in a very different form from what has been imagined by any theorists, and that causes not now understood or known existed anterior and during the flood, acting upon matter in a measure not now known, and with an energy inconceivable, produced the phenomena known as geological facts.

Hence it is plain that Mr. Barnes's demonstrated fact is destitute of many elements of a demonstration taking his book for our guide. A perfect demonstration requires that all persons perceiving all the facts of the case must be convinced that the proposition is true; the causes must be adequate to the effect; and it must be made to appear that the facts could not have had an existence by means of a creative power which could have produced them in less time than that specified. All of these conditions are wanting. Compare this pretended demonstration with the claim of the Christian world, that the Bible is the word of God. It cannot be denied that the miracles of Christ and his resurrection and fulfilment of prophecy, are attested by better evidence than the facts of geology. Now for the demonstration. If the miracles testified to were performed, and if prophecy has been fulfilled, and we all know it has been, it follows that these miracles were performed by divine power, and that the prophets were inspired by God, and that no other cause could have produced such effects; and altogether prove that the Bible, to which these miracles and prophecies bear witness, is, in truth, the word of God. We are surprised that Mr. Barnes should so confidently oppose this pretended geological demonstration that the earth has existed so many thousands or millions of years to the divine authority of the Bible, understood as the Chris-

tian world have generally understood it: we would respectfully suggest that he has widely departed from the principles which he laid down as the basis of his discussion. It will be remembered that he said, "The friends of such a revelation have a right to go into the fullest examination of these points, and to demand such evidence of the truth of the alleged facts as shall be sufficient to neutralize all that is urged in behalf of the proposed revelation, or such as shall demonstrate that the alleged facts cannot *possibly* be otherwise than they are affirmed to be," p. 27. Is his geological theory sustained by such evidence? Has it been proved that the crust of the earth could not be *possibly* created in less time than what is claimed? And will Mr. Barnes seriously say that this pretended demonstration is sustained by evidence superior to the positive evidence that the Bible is the word of God? We ask again, if his positive affirmation of the certainty of the truth of his geological theory, and that either the interpretation of the Bible must be changed or the inspiration of that book be abandoned, is sufficiently respectful to a very large number of men, among whom the late Prof. Moses Stuart, of Andover, may be classed, inferior to none in their great attainments in literature, and who do not believe that the laws of language will admit of the change demanded? It would seem that he makes no possible use of his fundamental position, for having proceeded in his discussion so far as though in application of it, he yet says nothing about facts, but introduces a theory which has never been substantiated, which can never be shown to be necessarily true. That he should do this surprises us when we think of his Christian integrity, and candor, and distinguished abilities. But it is the legitimate consequence of attempting to build an argument upon what, if it were meant as a bare assertion, disconnected with any results, is at best a truism, or if a premise to an important conclusion, an absurdity.

II. We will now examine the position of our author, that a pretended revelation from God could not be received by mankind which should "violate the constitutional principles of our nature," or which should contradict any moral truth known to be truth, by a "power of judging," which "lies back of the direct teachings of revelation."

The power in man of forming a judgment respecting moral truth and all moral conduct, assumed in the book before us, seems to be unlimited. A few quotations will prove that this statement is not extravagant. "Is it not implied . . . that there *is* some standard of what is reasonable and right, by which God admits that even his own character is to be judged? Has he not made us so that it is necessary that the doctrines which he reveals, as well as his own conduct, and character, shall be seen to be conformable to that standard before we can perceive that he is worthy of confidence and love? . . . When God appeals to us, and when men attempt to vindicate his character, is the ground of the appeal and of the vindication the mere fact that God has done what he has done, and that, therefore, it is right; or that all that is right in his act is in his will; or is it that there is such a thing as right in itself, and that we have been so made, after his own image, that we can see and appreciate what is right when it is fairly submitted to our understanding?" p. 76. Referring to Rom. v. 8, our author says, "It is assumed here that men are endowed with the faculty of judging what is proper and right, as an expression of love, and that all that is demanded in such an expression was found in the act of God in giving his Son to die for men, when they were yet sinners. There was that which, in the nature of things, was demanded as the proper expression of love, and all this was found in the work of redemption," p. 83.

In our opinion, our author is wrong in the sentiments here expressed. And he must have been aware that they could not be received by a large class of Christians. But if his positions respecting the unlimited power of judging, which he claims for men, and that too, by "the promptings of their nature," so that they can tell what is demanded as an expression of the infinite love of God, it might still be difficult to prove that the Bible is the word of God from the truth of its statements. For if man can judge what is demanded as an expression of love (and we know of no greater mystery than the mystery of redemption), man could give a description of it in a book. Neither would a revelation seem to be needed to communicate to man what he knows without a revelation. We have some

suggestions to make in opposition to the sentiments of Mr. Barnes.

We hold that we have no perception of moral truth or of moral right, as an abstract principle. Whatever is true in respect to the disputes of Realists and Nominalists (and we have no serious objections to the opinions of the former, when properly understood), we apprehend that our knowledge begins with things or entities. We decidedly object to the doctrine of eternal abstract ideas advocated by Timæus Locrus, wrongly imputed to Plato, which doctrine, our author seems to adopt. The idea, according to Plato, always belongs to the entity of which it is the idea or peculiar form. Let philosophers dispute as they please about the nature of ideas, the question after all can hardly be considered practical, for substances and their properties are the objects of knowledge. But the thing, substance, or being, is first known. We first know what a triangle is before we can measure its angles by right angles. The naturalist examines a new plant or tree before he assigns it to its appropriate class. A knowledge of the individuals is anterior to grouping them together according to peculiarities, properties, ideas, or peculiar forms. Moral truth is an attribute of a moral being, as really as angles are the properties of figures bounded by straight lines. There is no such thing as morality independent of a moral being. To talk of holiness and goodness as existing in themselves, separate from rational beings, would be as absurd as it would be to talk of angles existing in themselves, separate from figures. The attributes of God are the original types of all moral qualities. He created man in his own image and likeness, but not equal to himself. Where now does man get his knowledge of goodness, holiness, justice, and love? Does he get it from conscious experience? What if he has now no experience in these attributes? Must he not look out of himself to find them? But where shall he search for them if all men are like himself? And besides we must have light to see light. There must be a light within or that which is without will not be visible. By pure intellection we cannot discern moral excellence; a depraved heart discovers no beauty in Christ, no desirable glory in God. We should say, that two conditions are

essential to the discovery of holiness and true goodness by a depraved being. The first is a revelation to him of God, to whom they belong, as essential attributes of his being. The second condition is, the faculty of perception existing in a likeness to that which is to be perceived or known. Let it not be said this theory contradicts itself, for food nourishes the life whose pre-existence is necessary to constitute that same food nutritious to the body. Perhaps the light must stimulate the sensorium, and thus call into activity a power of vision before it can become a medium through which a knowledge of external objects is obtained. If these things be so, it should not be thought strange that by the Holy Spirit, the Divine word, a symbol of the truth of God, is made the power of God unto the imparting of divine life to the soul, and the medium by which his excellent glory is seen. Our doctrine is, a knowledge of moral qualities depends on a knowledge of God, and God is not known by men but by a revelation.

Again we say, moral laws must of necessity possess the spirit of love. If the substance of all moral law is love; if love is the fulfilling of law, destitute of love we can neither understand the true moral idea, nor that which distinguishes moral law from other laws. We may by observation learn what is useful to a certain degree; but a consideration of the useful could never be an infallible guide, nor being associated as it would be, where love is wanting, with selfishness, it would not lead to a knowledge of moral right, but, on the contrary, cause men to praise the most vicious and the vilest conduct. If these suggestions are true, men are destitute of the power of exercising a true judgment respecting moral conduct, or character, or moral truth, provided they are, as the Scriptures affirm, destitute of the love of God, unless God reveal himself unto them. They have no moral standard in the mind, no promptings of a virtuous nature, no conceptions of the abstract of right; no examples of goodness in men destitute of true love like themselves, by means of which they could rightly decide upon the claims of a pretended revelation from God; nay more, a true revelation would, unless accompanied with the power of him who gives it, sooner be rejected than received.* It may

* Men destitute of love of God may know Him as an omnipotent, omni-

be proper to inquire what history and the Bible teach, and whether, by such standards, these statements are proved to be true.

It should be remembered that we are not certain that there are any people wholly destitute of a knowledge of God by revelation; for while it is probable that the most correct views of God, which obtained among ancient nations, were derived from the sacred Scriptures, it cannot be denied that these rays of light have been reflected from one generation to another, down to the present time, through tradition and meditation on the works and providence of God. And while, as would be natural, in each successive generation, they have shone with less brilliancy, and been less perceptible to the obscured reason of man, they may still afford some relief from absolute darkness.

From such light as history gives, we perceive that heathen nations, from near that point of time, when, according to the Bible, the whole human race were in one family, and of course were conversant with a revelation from God, gradually deteriorated in knowledge of God, in moral principles, and in conduct. The same is true of their philosophy and literature. If we go back so far as history will guide us, we shall be convinced that in philosophy the most ancient men were the most profound, in religious belief they were the most correct, in morals and moral sentiments the most pure, in social life the most chaste, and in literature their superiority was so great that it is manifest to all. This

scient Being who is from everlasting, an absolute Sovereign who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, and who by no means will clear the guilty. They may have a consciousness of being his enemies without appreciating what it would be to be his friends; of having transgressed his laws, without understanding the nature of true obedience; of impending judgment for transgression, without any desire to obey him; of the blessedness of those who love him, without the least conception of the nature of that blessedness or desire to participate in it. Conscience with them works emotions corresponding to their relation to God. They tremble while they hate, they fear while they endeavor to escape the judgments of God. But in their hatred they rather say of God he is a "hard master," than penitently submit to his authority. And by the natural action of the mental faculties, and by voluntary effort, even this knowledge by degrees vanishes from their thoughts; while they form to themselves an ideal object of worship agreeable to their hearts, their views of moral truth will partake of their debased affections. So that even with a revelation they will be willing to place their own pleasure before its authority.

fact is frankly acknowledged by the most distinguished persons of later date. The very common opinion now entertained that Plato was in advance of his age is contradicted by himself, for he acknowledges that his most exalted religious sentiments, and his most correct views of God, were borrowed from very ancient writings. The truth is, he was behind an age which was fast plunging into moral darkness; and if Thucydides, in the introduction to his history, speaks disparagingly of past generations, he has himself given a detail of corrupt maxims and conduct of which the generation of men who lived in the days of Homer seem to have had no conception. If some have supposed that Virgil gives more consistent and distinct views of a future state than Homer, from whom he copies almost every beauty that adorns the Æneid, it should be remembered that Homer gives a picture of the commingling of the hopes and fears of men respecting the future, while Virgil presents those opinions which the wiser class hoped might be true. But in respect to God, his worship, and the duties of man, the age of Homer must have been incomparably superior to the age of Virgil. If we travel down from the commencement of the Christian era to the present time, we shall be impressed with the obvious fact that heathen nations have not improved upon that wretched state described in the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans; but they have degenerated to a fearful degree; they have not "oscillated back" to correct opinions of God, or of moral duty, or to stability in the integrity of their original constitution. In the light of history we would ask, what corrupt or shameful lusts, what fierce and raging passions of depraved human nature have not been deified, and worshipped with corresponding rites and practices, by those who have not the written word? What crimes against nature have not been committed, justified, and made the subject of song? What natural affection has not been smothered under moral corruption? What response to these questions do our missionaries give from Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea? Do they not say with united voice, that what Paul said of the heathen in his day exists now; that language can convey no adequate conception of what the eye-witness knows to be true? Let the reader call to mind the uncleanness, the dishonoring of their

own bodies between themselves, the crimes against nature committed both by men and women, unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, envy, murder, deceit, malignity, hatred to God, destitution of natural affection, ascribed by the apostle to the heathen. Let them call to mind the sin of the Sodomites so common among the heathen in the days of Virgil, that he celebrates it as if it were a chaste affection; the prostitution of the Babylonian maidens or matrons in the temple of Venus, as described by Herodotus, and then say if among these heathens any evidence can be found of the truth of the assertion of our author that "there are accurate deductions of reason, there are just convictions of conscience, there is a moral sense which approves of what is right, and which disapproves of what is wrong; there is a perception of what is right in the relations of life; in the duties which men owe to their fellow men, in the duties which they owe their Maker." Let it be remembered that the cause of this lamentable moral blindness and corruption is ascribed in the Bible to the fact, that God having shown unto men what may be known of himself, they had held the truth in unrighteousness; had refused to glorify him; had become vain in their imaginations, till their foolish heart was darkened, so that in their folly "they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." Thus are we taught that God is the true light of the soul, the "light by which we see light;" that when this light is excluded as it may be by moral corruption, there is no sentiment too base to be adopted, no crime too revolting to nature to be committed, as a sacred religious act. All the facts of history unite with the observation of our missionaries, to prove that with the loss of the knowledge of God, all ideas of moral conduct fade from the mind, and the faculty of conscience ceases to be exercised. The statements of a learned missionary, made recently in Mr. Barnes's church, more than corroborate all that is here suggested. We therefore think we are warranted in the conclusion, that our knowledge of moral truth comes not by a necessary conception of the true, the right, the holy, but by a knowledge of God, in whom all goodness exists, uncreated, unchangeable, and in absolute perfection. Divested

of a knowledge of God, the mind can no more make moral distinctions than a blind man can distinguish colors, and he becomes so debased, that he seems to the observer destitute of even a conscience. I say history seems to teach this. Another fact we think is taught by history. In proportion as men become ignorant of the God of the Bible, just in that proportion will they lose all conceptions of his adorable perfections, and moral truth. Provided, therefore, the human mind, in its departure from rectitude and correct moral perceptions does not, as Mr. Barnes suggests, follow a law of the planetary system, in the perfection of which declinations are an element, but the law of decay and death, from which there is no resurrection or restoration but by the omnipotent power of God, the fact of a restoration of the healthy activity of a constitutional faculty of the human soul, and knowledge of truth, the most important truth to rational beings through the teachings of the Bible, would make very much towards proving that that book is the word of God. And we apprehend that when Mr. Barnes reviews what he said respecting the "oscillating back" of the constitution of man by its own inherent energy, he will say that he wrote without due consideration. He will call to mind that nations that have thus erred from the truth, decay and die physically, as well as intellectually and morally. But we do not make this suggestion here to prove the inspiration of the Bible, but to bring fairly before the mind the unreasonableness of ascribing to man a power of deciding upon the claims of the Bible of being an inspired book, the word of God, according as its teachings conform to or deny moral truth or fact, known or discovered, or discoverable, without a revelation. With such a standard of judgment, what abominations might not, and have not been received as given by divine authority; and may we not suppose that the most sacred truths would be rejected by the same standard. Should it be urged that it remains true that, when men perceive the truth, they know it. It may be answered, if this be so, it does not follow that they will never mistake falsehood for truth, and be very positive in their error. But how are men to arrive at the knowledge of moral truth? There is no possible evidence from history that men would ever have a conception of morality, without some knowledge

of God, by revelation. If the apostle Paul says, the heathen show the work of the law written in the heart, he also said, that God had showed unto them what might be known of him. Again, it may be said, that we do have moral perceptions, some of which we feel assured are true. In reply we would say, that if our correct moral perceptions are received from God through the Bible, then we have evidence that that book is from him, and he certainly will not contradict himself. But we will not use this argument here, but will inquire what the Bible says of men who enjoy its teachings when left to their reason, moral sense, or impulses.

The prophet Isaiah thus describes the reception Christ would meet with from men, "For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness: and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted,"

of his words is ascribed not to a lack of evidence addressed to the understanding, for there was enough of that, and more would not have convinced those who rejected that which was given, but to a depravity of heart which overpowered reason, and shut out a knowledge of the excellent glory of the Saviour. And the Scriptures again declare: "And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not," John i. 5. "He was in the world and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not," vs. 10. And yet without this light the darkness of the mind is total; for we are taught again, "*That* was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," vs. 9. And why do not men comprehend the light? Christ himself said, "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved," John iii. 19, 20. The import of the following Scriptures is equally clear: "But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled which he spoke: Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spoke of him," John xii. 37, 41. "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them a strong delusion that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness," 2 Thess. ii. 10–12. These Scriptures will be sufficient for our purpose, although very many more passages might be quoted of similar import, and there is no need of comments to bring out their meaning. That moral darkness which resists the evidence that Christ is the Son of God, and that he spake the words of the Father, will manifest itself in a rejection of moral distinctions, and the

adoption of the most absurd and corrupting sophisms. All this is true to history. It is constantly illustrated in the life and sayings of men who reject the Scriptures.

This fact Mr. Barnes seems not to be ignorant of, although he did not appreciate its force. He gives an illustration in Mr. Hume, who so utterly discarded moral distinctions that he resolved chastity into a matter of convenience, and maintained that murder is no crime, as it is simply "turning a few ounces of blood from their natural channel." Notwithstanding this obliteration of moral perception was not peculiar to Mr. Hume, but is common to all who wantonly and perseveringly, and with derision, reject the divine authority of the sacred Scriptures, Mr. Barnes maintains that men have such a constitution, that such sentiments could not be received, even if no revelation of God had been given to mankind. It should, however, be admitted here, that by resisting the gospel of Christ the moral perception is depraved more effectually than by a gradual extinguishment of light by ignorance; and we would not make the history of Hume, and other modern infidels, an example illustrating a general fact, if it did not correspond substantially with what occurs in the life of all those who have lost a knowledge of the God of the Bible.

Shall we then say that men without a revelation from God, or with a revelation which they have rejected, are capable, by reason or moral sense, truthfully to decide upon the evidence that a book is from God by a comparison of its teachings with their own notions of moral truth or right? We certainly have no confidence in the judgment of such men.

It should be remembered here that though we have discussed the subject as presented by our author, who starts with the position that a book which should contradict a known fact of science, or any known moral truth, could not be received as the word of God by mankind; this is not the real question which is aimed at in the book before us. There is, we apprehend, no difficulty in any man's mind respecting a supposed contradiction between the Bible and any facts of science, or the natural constitution of man, or known moral truth. Mr. Barnes gives no instance of such supposed contradiction. The Bible denies the existence of

no mathematical or geological facts. The question of supposed contradiction relates entirely to a theory on a supposed deduction from facts. The same is true respecting moral facts. No one imagines that the Bible violates any constitutional principle of our nature, or refuses to man any privilege he would have enjoyed had he not become a sinner. The supposed contradictions refer entirely to the relations of men to each other, who, by sin, have fallen from the estate in which they were created, and are neither permitted nor able to enjoy its privileges, who must be restrained, assisted, protected, fed, and clothed oftentimes by each other, because of disease, ignorance, and idleness, and other sins, and whose present earthly sojourn is only temporarily given as an act of grace, to see if they, by repentance and faith, will become fitted, not for a return to the estate and privileges of Adam, but for an estate of confirmed holiness in the kingdom of our Lord. How easy is it in such questions for men who are unwilling to give up privileges which God would have given, provided man had never fallen, to claim, like disobedient and self-willed children, these forfeited privileges as a right, even against the institution formed after the pattern of grace to the evil and unthankful, and which within their beneficent operation necessarily deny to men what they can no longer enjoy?

Mr. Barnes has given us an illustration of what is here affirmed. In his book entitled "Church and Slavery," he says, "nothing can be more certain than that man was formed by his Maker for freedom. Nothing can be more true than the declaration of the immortal instrument which asserts our national independence, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; and that among those are life and LIBERTY. . . . . We want no book," such men will say, which proclaims other doctrines than these; we can embrace no book as a revelation from God which does not coincide with the great laws of our nature;—those laws which proclaim that all men have a right to be free; no book "which departs in its teachings from those great laws CAN POSSIBLY BE FROM GOD."—Church and Slavery, pp. 37, 38.

By such questions which relate to statutory and temporal regulations, such as in the judgment of man the pecu-

liarities of particular people or nations, demoralized by sin, require, Mr. Barnes would test the divine authority of the Scriptures. This is a wide departure from his fundamental position, indeed, but such a departure as might have been expected; and if such a man as Mr. Barnes admits, as a test of the divine authority of the Bible, its agreement with a declaration which has not been by any means received as true by mankind, and which, if understood according to its import rigidly construed, is absurd, will not such principles, leading to such results in a man so truly Christian and so learned, give great encouragement to wicked, unlearned, and unstable men to despise the word of God because it contradicts their vain conceits? Who knows what is best for man, already condemned for his sins, but having received from God a season of grace, dwells for a little season on this sin-stricken earth? As a race of depraved beings dwell together, they would not be restrained by reason or humanity, or civil law, from mutual slaughter, if God, by his providence, did not rule over the affairs of men; while a race so depraved, will most certainly claim as a right what would have been only a gift, even to holy created beings, and demand from others the fruits of love and benevolence which they have not in their own hearts to give in return, or to appreciate when bestowed, and will even pronounce the laws and punishments unjust and cruel which restrain their wanton lust. Will they be the proper judges of what is right and fit in institutions, the objects of which are to preserve them in existence against the ravages of their sins, and to place them in a favorable condition to receive the gospel of Christ? And yet, our author leaving questions which relate to constitutional principles of our nature that have survived, with a feeble life, the effects of our moral death, upon which he prepared to build his argument, introduces in his illustrations regulations demanded for the proper government of men living by an act of grace, for whom the privileges of holy beings would no longer be a blessing, independent of statutory and special laws and the overruling providence of God. In respect to these regulations, necessarily varying to suit the culture or ignorance, the wealth or poverty, the health or feebleness, the morality or the lawlessness of the people, men will be perpetually in dispute, urging now a

real or imaginary universal truth, now a necessary temporary restraint. Inflated with vanity of mind and incited with a selfish heart, and a love of fame, their minds will be distorted, so that they will often put darkness for light and light for darkness, and call good evil and evil good. Give to men in such circumstances a right to determine the inspiration of the Bible by a comparison of its teachings with such questions as Mr. Barnes introduces for this purpose. Will they not indulge a wanton irreverence for that sacred book, and vainly imagine that they may of right condemn it if it contradict their favorite opinions? This is not theory. Such a state of things already exists. Men despise the Bible because they think themselves wiser than what is written. We will now give our opinion of the foundation of faith in God's word.

The perfection and proper blessedness of man depends on a knowledge of God. "And this is eternal life that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." It follows from this proposition that a knowledge of God in Christ Jesus is possible, and that the revelation of Him is clear, certain, admitting of no contradiction or doubt. God in Christ is the true light of the soul, by which it perceives or apprehends the moral, the holy, the just, and the true. The will of God is the last ultimate standard or reason. The glory of God revealed, is a certain, clear, unalterable object of knowledge. While the mind looks steadily at this light, the whole soul is filled with light, and is not dark in any part. God and his ways are not judged by any standard. He is acknowledged as containing in himself the ultimate reason, infinite perfection, the first dawn of light, and the final solution of all moral questions. By his will the right and fit, the just and true, are determined. When we see him revealed in Christ we stop not to inquire whether he is holy and true according to the holy in itself, or the true in itself, or in the nature of things. We then have our first knowledge of holiness and true goodness.

The proof of a revelation from God must of necessity be divine and certain, because it is divine. It must bear a divine seal. Being divine it must give positive, infallible assurance to him who receives it. It admits of no negative,

and it were profane to question its authority or to subject the fact thus proved to an examination by tests drawn from human knowledge, as to an ultimate standard of judgment. We would not object to testing the pretensions of any assumed revelation from God, which wants divine proof that its claim is just as proposed by Mr. Barnes, provided time can be profitably and rightfully employed in such business.

The church claims for the Bible that it is proved to be the word of God by Divine evidence.

1. The inspiration of the Bible or the revelation of God in it is proved by miracles.

Moses knew from the burning bush that God called unto him, and commissioned him to act as the leader of the Israelites. When "the people saw the thunderings and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking," they knew that the Lord was there, and that he gave them the law from his mouth. Those who saw the miracles of Christ, witnessed his resurrection, and the wonders performed in his name by his followers, knew that he was a teacher come from God, for no man could do these miracles unless God were with him. These divine works were the seal of God proclaiming the authority of those who spake in his name.

2. The inspiration of the Bible is proved by the fulfilment of prophecy.

What the Scriptures foretold respecting the posterity of the three sons of Noah, giving a general statement in relation to their condition down to the present time; of the nation of Israel, of Babylon, of Tyre, of Egypt, of Persia, of Greece, of Rome, and of other particular races and tribes, God has so fulfilled that no doubt can exist that the prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The ancient prophets predicted that one should come of the seed of David, fixing the time of his appearance, particularly describing his history, the circumstances attending his death and burial, the feelings which all people would have towards him. These prophecies had a fulfilment in Jesus Christ so perfect and complete that he is proved to be that very person described. This fulfilment of prophecy establishes beyond the possibility of doubt that God spake by the prophets. It may be added that every man, whether he

lived in the time of Christ or now lives, may find his own character given in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, his aversion to Christ, with perfect precision. He can learn more of his own moral state from this foreshown opposition to the Messiah, than he can discover from a reflection on his own thoughts aided by all that men have written on mental or moral science. Thus prophecy reaches to every man's understanding, through the history of the past and the present; to every man's consciousness, through his natural dislike to the adorable Saviour. This proof lacks no element of certainty. The hand of God in it is so manifest that all who will may see it.

It may be urged that men do nevertheless doubt. If they will doubt, they have never been able to give any reason for their doubts. They have denied the possibility of miracles, have affirmed that the miracles of Christ were by demoniacal and not by divine power, and have attempted to oppose them by assuming that the pretended miracles of impostors or tricks of jugglers have equal claim to be considered divine works. But this is all assumption. This kind of opposition has resulted in showing that no defect exists in this species of proof, by which we know that the Bible is the word of God. Should it be said that this evidence is not irresistible, for men do disbelieve; we say it is irresistible to reason unenslaved, unrestrained, and acting with the energy inspired by a truth-loving heart. Reason finds no defects. Reason is satisfied. It demands, it asks nothing more. It fears no contradictions, no difficulties from newly-discovered facts. And yet we admit that men doubt. The wicked, debased Israelites doubted after they had seen the wonders performed in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and at Mount Sinai. The Jews doubted after they had seen the miracles of our Lord. Could these doubts have been effectually removed by other wonders? No, never. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." The difficulty is with the depraved heart; the perverse will that receives not the love of the truth. This will resists communion with God, a knowledge of him which is the true light and life, or living light of the soul. Through its ceaseless activity, the conscience, the reason,

the judgment, in respect to divine things, have no free exercise. That which has been demonstrated is soon forgotten, and the mind seeks peace in ignorance of God. Fallen men are capable of receiving some knowledge of God through a revelation; but his excellent glory is concealed until they are delivered from the moral death which has come upon them by sin. This deliverance is wrought by the Spirit of God, through the truth. Until this is effected, the evidences of a revelation, though for a time they will be convincing, are constantly passing from the mind, leaving it a slave to doubts. To remove these doubts it were vain to ask further evidence addressed to the reason. Additional evidence will have no tendency to remove the difficulty. And it is injurious to indulge a desire for clearer proof, thus causing a diversion from the necessity of regenerating and sanctifying grace. The truth of what is here suggested is understood by the Christian who finds that doubts not caused by defect of evidence, and which cannot be removed by the examination of evidence addressed to the understanding alone, disappear, and the divine glory is perceived and known as the great, eternal, unchangeable fact, as soon as the heart comes into sweet communion with the Father and the Son, by the word and through the presence of the Spirit. The order in which the proof is exhibited to the mind seems to be this: First, The seal of God upon his word by miracles and prophecy fulfilled. Second, The delightful perception of God in the truths revealed, by which the soul, beholding the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ as in a glass, and being "changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord," gives to the reason or understanding the power of appreciating the perfect demonstration contained in the fact that the Bible is the word of God. Then is fulfilled the Scriptures, which say, "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. iv. 6. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," 2 Cor. v. 1. The Bible is to such persons above reason; for, being the word of God, and

revealing Him, they behold in it his excellent glory. The truth is received without a painful effort at recollection or demonstration. It is a first truth, a simple fact, made sure by God himself. Those who receive this knowledge rejoice in facts which science or reason of a created being could never have discovered—facts, by a reception of which the heart softens, relents, and turns away from sin as the great evil; and the mind is filled with unspeakable and undying consolation. This life of faith is the true life. It is full of joy and consolation. In it the creature is united to the Creator, the finite to the infinite, the dependent to the independent, the subject to the sovereign, the disciple to his Lord and Master; and the redeemed, the saved, participate in the benefits of the love of Christ, and receive it in themselves as the ruling power in the soul.

Art. V.—A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters LII. and LIII.

Having predicted at the close of the last chapter the end of the avenging judgments with which the people of Jerusalem were to be smitten, the prophet now summons them to prepare themselves for the wondrous scenes that are about to unfold to them under the Messiah's reign, vs. 1, 2. The calamities with which they had been overwhelmed, were in retribution of their sins; their redemption is to be the work of grace, and is to be conferred in a way that will show that it is Jehovah who bestows it, and to vindicate him as the God of Israel, vs. 3–6. Heralds are exhibited as coming from the east—the scene where the antichristian host is to be destroyed, chap. xxxiv., and announcing from the heights of Mount Olivet, that the Messiah has come, and the watchmen of the city as repeating the glad tidings, vs. 7, 8. The ruins of Jerusalem are summoned to join in the shout of joy and praise, vs. 9, 10. Those of the Israelites who are yet dispersed in the ends of the earth, are next summoned to quit the scenes of their exile, and promised that God will be with them and guide and defend them in

their return, vs. 11, 12. The Messiah, they are assured, will then appear in power and glory suited to his office, however humble had been his form at his first advent, and will display his grace in redeeming the nations—while he confounds and overwhelms those who oppose his reign, vs. 13, 15.

1. Apostrophe, "Awake! awake! Put on thy strength, O Zion! Put on thy garments of beauty, O Jerusalem," vs. 1.

2, 3. Metonymies of Zion and Jerusalem for their inhabitants.

4, 5. Hypocatastases in the use of putting on strength, as though it were a breastplate or shield in place of assuming it; and putting on garments of beauty, for preparing themselves mentally for the great scenes of redemption that are about to unfold to them; and the reason of the command is, that none but the pure are thereafter to dwell in Jerusalem.

6. Metonymy of the uncircumcised and unclean body, for the unrenewed mind. "For no more shall there add to come into thee an uncircumcised and unclean (person)," vs. 1. That is, none are thereafter to enter Jerusalem but the holy. Not only are no Gentile enemies ever again to conquer it and pollute it by their presence and domination, but none of the seed of Abraham are to enter it, except such as are purified and have become fit subjects of the Messiah's sceptre. They are all to be cleansed in the fountain of Christ's blood and have his law written in their hearts, and his Spirit put within their inward parts, Zech. xiii. 1; Jeremiah xxxi. 31–34; Isaiah xi. 9.

7, 8, 9, 10. Hypocatastases in the use of shake thyself from the dust, arise, sit, and loose the bands of thy neck, the acts of a captive on receiving freedom, for analogous acts of one who is being freed from sin and its curse, and becoming a subject of Christ's gracious sway. "Shake thyself from the dust, arise, sit, O Jerusalem! Loose the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter Zion," vs. 1, as a slave on being made free, raises himself up from the toil over which he was bending, puts off the chain with which he was bound, shakes off the dust from his dress, and seats himself at ease; so the inhabitants of Jerusalem are summoned to disengage themselves from the shackles of sin in which they have been held, remove the grime and dust with which it

has stained and defaced them, and take the attitude of free, pure, and joyous subjects of the Messiah. They are no longer to wear the fetters of sin; they are no longer to bear the marks of the debasement and misery with which it had blighted and deformed them.

11, 12. Metonymies of Jerusalem and Zion for their inhabitants.

13. Metaphor in denominating Zion, used for its population, "captive daughter." These apostrophes thus bespeak the opening of a new era, the commencement of a redeemed and blessed life.

14, 15. Hypocatastases in the use of selling and redeeming. "For thus saith Jehovah: Ye were sold for nought, and not for money shall ye be redeemed," vs 3. Their being sold, is used to denote their being delivered into the power of their enemies and carried into captivity. That they were sold for nought, means that their captors neither gave God an equivalent for them, nor did anything by which they acquired the right of property in them. They were his people, and he relinquished them to their conquerors, without a price, because by their great sins they had become odious and a dishonor to him. Their being redeemed without money, is used to indicate that God is to recall them of his own sovereign right and by his own power. It will not be because of any services they have rendered him. It will not be because of any compensatory gifts he is to bestow on the nations by whom they are held in exile. He will rescue them simply of his own good pleasure, and for ends immeasurably above their deserts, and the deserts of those among whom they are scattered; and that concern only his glory. The permission of the Gentiles will not be asked. Their numbers, their power, their policy, are to be no obstacles to his designs. The signals of his presence will awe them into acquiescence and co-operation, chap. lxvi. 19, 20. That the enemies by whom they had from age to age been oppressed, had no title to them, he proceeds to exemplify.

"For thus saith Jehovah, Into Egypt went down my people first to sojourn there. Also the Assyrian oppressed them for nothing; and now what is there to me here, saith Jehovah, that my people is taken away for nothing. Its

rulers howl, saith Jehovah, and continually all the day my name is blasphemed!" vs. 4, 5. The Egyptians did not acquire any right to subject the Israelites to slavery, from the mere fact that they resided within their jurisdiction. Instead, their oppression of them was the grossest violation of their rights. The Assyrians had no right to conquer the ten tribes of Israel and carry them into captivity. It was a work of lawless ambition and rapine. And so the antichristian nations who will have conquered Jerusalem immediately before Christ's second advent, and carried half the population into captivity, Zech. xiv. 2, will have no legitimate right to their persons or property. They will be conspirators against God as well as against them, and regarding their triumph over them as a triumph over him, will blaspheme his name doubtless, as neither having the power nor the purpose to re-establish them there and reign over them as their king. That the rulers of the city are to howl, implies that they are to be overwhelmed with disappointment and anguish at their misfortune. To vindicate himself from accusation and doubt he will interpose to rescue his people.

"Therefore, my people shall know my name, therefore in that day (shall they know) that I am he that said, Behold me!" vs. 6, or Lo, I am here. His vindication of himself from the detractions that will be continually uttered, and verification of his promises, will require that he should reveal himself and deliver his people. That they shall know his name, means that they shall be made to know, by the clearest manifestations, the reality of his being, his presence and his perfections as Jehovah, their covenant God. That they shall at once see that he is the being who said, Behold me, signifies that he will reveal himself immediately and visibly, as he promised to reveal himself to the Israelites when he was about to proclaim to them the decalogue. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Lo I come unto thee in a cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee and believe thee for ever," Exodus xix. 9. So he will come in a cloud now and reveal himself to them in his dazzling glory. A herald, accordingly, is immediately to announce his advent and entrance on his reign. "How timely on the mountains are the feet of one bringing glad tidings, publishing peace, bringing glad tidings of good things, publishing sal-

vation; saying to Zion, Thy God reigneth!" vs. 7. While the enemies are still exulting in their victory and blaspheming Jehovah, and the rulers are wailing in grief and despair, a messenger coming from the eastward, the scene where the antichristian host is to meet its overthrow from the avenging fires of the Messiah, is to reach the top of the Mount—probably of Olives—and announce the glad tidings of the advent of Jehovah, and conquest of his foes. They are joyful tidings, tidings of good things—of peace, of salvation, of the reign of God. That annunciation from the mount is to be proclaimed in the city.

"The voice of thy watchmen! They raise the voice; together will they shout; for eye to eye shall they see on Jehovah's returning to Zion," vs. 8. The watchmen are persons stationed on the walls opposite the mountain to look for the approach of messengers from the battle field, and proclaim the intelligence brought by them. They are to catch the glad news of the herald and instantly repeat it in loud tones to the city. A pause is probably to follow their proclamation of the tidings by the herald, ere they shout together; as it is given as the reason of their shout, that they shall see eye to eye on Jehovah's returning to Jerusalem; the meaning of which is that they, perhaps from the elevated points on which they are to be stationed, will see distinctly the first signals of Jehovah's approach; and will at the same moment announce it with a shout. It indicates accordingly that the Messiah is to come from Edom with dyed garments, from Bozrah glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength; and is to be visible to all eyes. No method could have been chosen that would more clearly show that his advent is to be personal and public. No pretext of tropes, no process of allegorization can wrench the prediction into a mere shadowy intimation that some other being, a human warrior, or a host of human warriors is to come and restore the city to liberty, peace, and prosperity. It is to set aside the words of the Spirit, and fabricate another prophecy, to attempt to force on them such a meaning.

16. Apostrophe. "Burst forth; shout together, ruins of Jerusalem; for Jehovah has comforted his people; has redeemed Jerusalem," vs. 9. This implies that the city is immediately to be raised from its ruin, by a reconstruction in

the beauty and splendor that are foretold of it, chapter liv. 11, 12, lx. 13. Her inhabitants are to be consoled by the termination of all their sufferings and sorrows; and she is to be for ever redeemed from the subjection in which she had been held so many ages by Gentile conquerors.

17. Hypocatastasis. "Jehovah has bared his holy arm to the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God," vs. 10. This is prophetic of what is to be predicated of God when he has thus come in power and glory in the person of the Messiah and redeemed his people. Baring his holy arm is used by substitution for his exerting his power in visible and impressive forms. That it is to take place in the eyes of all nations, shows that the displays of his power in the deliverance of his people are to be made in all lands. The Israelites being scattered throughout the world, as their restoration is to be attended with special signals of God's presence and direction of their return, the knowledge of his interposition, his recognition of them as his people, the miracles he performs to protect and aid them in their way to their national land, will make the whole population of the globe witness [illegible]

one part of the world to another for the purpose of gaining a more eligible residence, but like their ancestors in the exodus from Egypt and the return from Babylon, as God's people, sustaining an intimate and peculiar relation to him, and called back to their land by his direct and almighty voice. And the command thus to return, is enforced by the assurance that Jehovah himself is to be with them.

23. Hypocatastasis. "For not in haste shall ye go out, and ye shall not depart in flight; for going before you is Jehovah, and bringing up your rear the God of Israel," vs. 12. As in the exodus from Egypt, the pillar of cloud went before the Israelites as they advanced towards the sea, but on their pausing, it passed over them, and stood between them and the hostile host of the Egyptians; so at this return, he will give equal signals of his gracious presence both in leading them on their way, and in defending them from their enemies.

24, 25. Hypocatastases in the use of rise and high in place, to denote an analogous exaltation in power, authority, and glory. "Behold, my servant shall do wisely; (and) rise and be exalted, and exceedingly high," vs. 13. My servant is the Messiah. He is to interpose at this recall of his scattered Israel, not in the humble garb and station in which he appeared at his first advent, but in a power and majesty and with an attendance of angelic hosts, that will be suitable to his deity, and the greatness of the work he comes to accomplish. His exaltation, glory, and success, are indeed to be the consequence of the depth of his humiliation at his first coming.

26, 27. Hypocatastases in the use of sprinkle nations to denote their purification from sin; and stop the mouth, to denote putting an end to the false and contemptuous notions of the Messiah which it had uttered. "As many were shocked at thee (so marred from man *was* his look, and his form from the sons of men) so shall he sprinkle many nations; concerning him shall kings stop their mouth, because what was not recounted to them they have seen; and what they had not heard, have they perceived," vs. 14, 15. The fact that he was so dishonored and marred at his first advent, in his rejection and crucifixion by man, is the very reason that he is to be exalted to the power and glory with which he will come

and deliver his ancient people, cleanse all the Gentile nations from their sins, and bring them to submission to his sceptre. The kings whose mouths he is to stop, are the kings, doubtless, who are to be arrayed against him at the great battle when the antichristian hosts are to be destroyed; and the proud and blasphemous thoughts which they are never more to utter, are the arrogations of the Man of sin and his party, who are to exalt themselves above the Messiah, and engage in war on his people, in the confident expectation that they shall conquer them, and preclude the establishment of his kingdom on the earth.

This chapter is thus a prophecy of the second coming of Christ in glory at the period of the destruction of antichrist and of the return of the Israelites, under his guidance, to their national land.

Chapter LIII. The prophet intimates that the prediction in the preceding chapter of the Messiah's interposition in person to destroy the hosts gathered against Jerusalem, and the restoration of the tribes under his guidance, would not be believed; and because of the humble form in which he was to appear at his first advent, vs. 1, 2. His person, his condition, and his life were to be so unlike the expectations the nation cherished in respect to him as a monarch, that they would despise and reject him, vs. 3. The repulse he was to meet, and the death to which he was to be subjected, was to be interpreted by his rejectors as signals of God's displeasure, vs. 4. But his sufferings were to be borne on our behalf. It was because we are guilty that he was to be smitten and put to death; and it was because he was to be innocent that he was to die for us, vs. 5, 6. He accordingly was to bear the insults and tortures under which his life was to sink, in perfect patience and calmness; and it was to be in his submission to death and the dishonors of the grave, that his deity was to shine forth in its brightest resplendence, vs. 7–9. Having thus died as a sacrifice for sin, he was to be raised from death, meet acceptance with Jehovah, be exalted to supreme power, conquer his enemies, redeem his people, and reign for ever as Messiah, vs. 10–12.

1. Hypocatastasis in the use of revealing the arm of Jehovah for revealing his person. "Who has believed our report? And the arm of Jehovah, to whom has it been re-

vealed?" vs. 1. The report of the prophet which he intimates no one had believed, is the prediction of the preceding chapter respecting the deliverance of Jerusalem and the restoration of Israel by the Messiah. The revelation of the arm of Jehovah, is the revelation of Jehovah himself in the person of the Messiah, and the meaning of the question is, Who has recognised Jehovah in the Messiah at his incarnation and during his ministry? Who saw from the holiness of his life, from the wisdom of his teachings, from the wonderfulness of his miracles, that he was Immanuel, the promised king of Israel?

3, 4, 5. Comparisons. "And he came up like the tender plant before him, and like the root from a dry ground; he had no form nor comeliness; and we shall see him, and (it will be) no sight that we should desire it. Despised and forsaken of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with disease—or grief, and—like one hiding his face from us—despised and we esteemed him not," vs. 2, 3. Instead of the majesty of a monarch, his aspect and garb will appear so clearly those of a humble subject, and instead of the cheerfulness and exultation of a conqueror, he will be so overcast with sadness and sorrow, that the leaders of the nation will recoil at the intimation that he is the Messiah. They will not discern in him a single trace of the qualities which they assume were most conspicuously to distinguish the Son of David their promised deliverer. He will seem like a frail plant in place of a sturdy tree, a stalk withering for want of water, instead of a towering cedar of Lebanon. The expressions, "a man of sorrows and acquainted with disease," are especially descriptive, there is reason to believe, of his sympathies with the sorrows and diseases of those whom he came to save, rather than of his own afflictions. There is no intimation in the Scriptures that he was ever the subject of disease. There was, perhaps, nothing in his conduct that more surprised the priests and rulers, than that he exerted his miraculous powers to relieve the miseries of individuals only, and made no corresponding effort to deliver the nation from the domination of the Romans. He had ample pity for the wretched and perishing; but they looked for a Messiah who should make it his chief business to release them from their vassalage to the Gentiles, and elevate them to stations of

dignity and authority in his court. The comparison of him to one hiding his face from them, is expressive, probably, of the construction put by the priests and rulers on his withdrawing from their presence at Jerusalem, except at the feasts, and exercising his office as teacher and miracle-worker chiefly in the remote cities and villages of Galilee, and retiring sometimes from the crowd, to secluded and desert places.

6, 7. Metaphors in the use of bore and carried. "Surely our sicknesses he bore, and our griefs he carried," vs. 4. He bore the sicknesses and griefs of those to whom he ministered by sympathizing with them in their sufferings and sorrows, and healing and cheering them. This is the sense which the evangelist ascribes to the prediction. "And he cast out the spirits with his word and healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses," Matthew viii. 16, 17. It was to his compassion accordingly that appeal was usually made by the suffering, or on their behalf, Matt. ix. 27, xv. 22, xvii. 15; Mark ix. 22; Luke xvii. 13. And it was his compassion, it is frequently represented, that prompted him to the miracles he wrought of healing and relief, Matt. xv. 32, xx. 34; Mark v. 19; Luke vii. 13.

The prophet now passes from his ministry to his seizure, trial, and crucifixion.

"And we thought him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted," vs. 4. This is prophetic of the views with which the priests and rulers contemplated him when scourged at the bar of Pilate, and hanging on the cross. They then called upon him to prove himself, if he could, to be the Son of God, by coming down from the cross, and treated his seeming helplessness and desertion by God as indubitable proofs that he was the object of his anger instead of approbation. "If he be the king of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said, I am the Son of God," Matt. xxvii. 42, 43. That God did not deliver him, they therefore regarded as showing that he was the object of the Divine vengeance.

"And he was pierced for our transgressions, bruised for

our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed," vs. 5. He was pierced by the nails and the spear for our transgressions. He was bruised by the scourge for our iniquities. The retributive infliction by which our reconciliation was procured, was upon him; and by the lacerations he suffered, the wounds we have received from sin are healed. No language could more expressly predict that his sufferings were to be wholly for us, not for himself; that the bruises he received in the buffets and scourgings to which he was subjected during his trial, and the wounds with which he was pierced on the cross, were in our behalf, and because of our transgressions; that the inflictions he endured were the means of our reconciliation, and that by his sufferings for our sins, the wounds they have brought on us are healed.

8. Comparison. "All we like sheep had gone astray; each to his own way we had strayed, and Jehovah laid on him the iniquity of us all," vs. 6. And he suffered thus, not for a part of men only, but for all. We had all sinned, each one in a way and degree peculiar to himself. We all therefore equally needed such a substitute to bear our iniquities. And Jehovah therefore laid on him the iniquity of us all.

9. Metonymy of iniquity for its penalty, suffering and death. That penalty accordingly he was to bear in innocence and meekness, not as one on whom it was inflicted because of his having sinned.

10, 11. Comparisons. "He was oppressed, and he humbled himself, and he will not open his mouth—as a lamb is brought to the slaughter, and as a sheep before its shearers is dumb—and he will not open his mouth," vs. 7. Though overwhelmed with blows, and scourgings, and insults, he made no resistance; he humbled himself to the condition to which he had descended of a subject, and withholding himself from exerting his infinite power to repel his assailants, bore their cruelty and malice as though he were helplessly in their hands. He uttered no denunciations of their injustice and malevolence. He indulged in no reproaches; he resorted to no pleas; he made no appeals to their sympathy; he indicated no wish to escape the outrages and death to which they consigned him. To have attempted

to repel or evade them, would have been inconsistent with the end for which he was subjected to them. He was to bear them in silence, in calmness, in unresisting and unmurmuring submission, because he was to bear them as the Lamb of God, spotless in himself, but the substitute of men and necessarily subjected to them, in order to the expiation of their sins. His not opening his mouth to exculpate or save himself, which was so mysterious to Herod and Pilate, was because of the office he filled as the sacrifice of the world, and was essential to the perfection of his obedience. As he bore the evils that were laid on him as the substitute of men, to have endeavored to evade them, would have been to refuse to bear the penalty of sin; to have remonstrated against them as unjust and cruel, would have been to impeach the rectitude of the penalty which God annexes to transgression. His dumbness was thus an utterance of immeasurable significance. It proclaimed, in the most expressive and resistless form, the righteousness of the penalty which, as the second Adam, he undertook to bear for the expiation of men.

This passage relates to his conduct before the high priest, the Sanhedrim, Herod and Pilate; that which follows to his death on the cross.

12. Hypocatastasis in the use of cut off, for put to death. "From constraint (by the guards who seized and bound him) and from judgment (at the bar of Pilate) he was taken (to crucifixion.) and who in his generation will think that he was cut off from the land of the living for the transgression of my people—a curse for them?" vs. 8. The constraint from which he was taken, was that to which he was subjected while in the hands of the guards, and the judgment, that of Pilate; and the meaning of the passage is, that after being seized and condemned, he was led forth to crucifixion. His being cut off from the land of the living, is used for his being put to death. Those in his generation were the Israelites who were contemporary with him, who knew that he claimed to be the Messiah, and that it was on that account at the instigation of the priests and rulers that he was crucified. The question who among them will *think* that he was crucified for the transgressions of men; that he was made a curse for them, is a prophecy that those

generally who were cognisant of his trial and crucifixion, would have no conviction that he died as a sacrifice for men.

13. Metonymy of curse for the person subjected to a curse; that is a penalty for men.

The prophet now passes from his death to his burial. "And he allowed with wicked (men) his grave, and with a rich (man) in his death; although he had done no violence, and no deceit was in his mouth," vs. 9. Instead of an instant resurrection, he submitted to the dishonors of a burial along with malefactors, who suffered the penalty of death because of the crimes they had committed; and with a rich man although he had done no violence like those who were crucified with him; nor uttered any deceit;—implying that they had been guilty both of theft and fraud. The reason that though innocent he submitted to burial was, that he bore the penalty of sin for men, a part of which is a return to dust. Though no mention is made by the evangelists of the burial of the thieves crucified with him, we know from the fact that their death was hastened by breaking their limbs, in order that their bodies might be removed before the sun set, that they must have been buried at near the same hour. Joseph, the owner of the sepulchre in which Christ was laid, it is expressly related by Matthew, xxvii. 57, was a rich man.

His sufferings and death were not the mere work of men; they were appointed by Jehovah in order to the salvation of mankind, and consequently he was to be raised from death to life, and accomplish the ends for which he was constituted the Messiah.

14. Metaphor in the use of seed for those whom he saves. "And Jehovah was pleased to crush him; he put him to grief. When his soul shall make an offering for sin, he shall see his seed; he shall prolong his days; and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand," vs. 10. His humiliations, his sufferings, and his death, were inflicted on him as the substitute of men by Jehovah; he gave his life an offering for sin; and having accomplished that, he was to see those in the invisible realms, who were already redeemed by him; and then rising to immortal life, was to be invested with all power in heaven and earth,

and reign prosperously for the great ends for which he became the Messiah. His seeing his seed, was probably his seeing the redeemed in paradise, as it seems to have preceded his return to life and exaltation.

15. Metonymy of his hand for himself. The work Jehovah has assigned him in his reign first on the throne of heaven, and then on earth, he is to execute prosperously. That work the prophet proceeds to show, is to be the recovery of men from sin, and gift to them of justification.

16. Metonymy of iniquities for their penalty. "From the labor of his life he shall see; he shall be satisfied. By the knowledge of him (he) my servant (the) righteous shall give righteousness to many, and their iniquities he will bear," vs. 11. From his work of expiation he shall see results that will satisfy him. Through the knowledge of him, imparted through his word and Spirit, he will grant forgiveness and acceptance to many: for he will have borne their sins. All the gracious gifts he will bestow in the renovation and justification of men, will thus be founded on his obedience and expiation, and he will carry those gifts to an extent as vast as his love desires, as unbounded as the well-being of his unfallen realms, as the glory of his name demands. The prophet now predicts his triumph over all his foes.

17. Metaphor in the use of poured out, for surrendering his life. "Therefore will I divide to him among the many, and among the strong shall he divide the spoil for a reward, because he poured out his soul to death, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bore the sin of many, and for the transgressors he shall make intercession," vs. 12.

18. Metonymy of sin for penalty. The many who are to be divided, that is assigned to him as a prey, are his enemies; the mighty whom he is to appropriate to himself as a spoil, are the great conspirators against him and his kingdom; the heresiarchs and apostates of the church, the usurping and persecuting civil rulers, and Satan and his hosts, who have leagued against him and his disciples from age to age, and who are, at his second coming, to combine to prevent him from assuming the sceptre of the earth. All these he will baffle and conquer in all their revolts and aggressions, and will rescue the race for ever from their power; because he will have taken the place of their

substitute, died on their behalf, and made expiation for their sins, and will for ever therefore intercede for their pardon and acceptance.

The prophecy thus presents a more full and graphic delineation than any other in the Old Testament, of all the great characteristics of Christ's humiliation, ministry, trial, crucifixion, resurrection, exaltation, and triumphant reign, of the vicariousness of his sufferings, their expiatory efficacy, and the office they fill as the ground of pardon and justification. None of the great elements of his work is omitted: none of the great features of his life but is drawn in distinct and glowing colors.

Art. VI.—Answers to Correspondents.

I. THE ACTS OF THE DIVINE NATURE IN CHRIST.

The question is sometimes asked, Whether the Divine Word in Christ took a direct and eminent part in his official work while on the earth, and was the author of the miracles he wrought, and of the revelations he made; or whether he is not rather to be regarded as laying aside or suspending the exertion of his divine attributes, on his union with the man Jesus; so that the acts of Jehovah Jesus in his life, ministry, and submission to death, were the acts exclusively of his human nature; and consequently, that the miracles he wrought were the work of the Father, and the prophecies he uttered the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, precisely as the revelations were that were made through the apostles, and the miracles that were wrought in connexion with their ministry. We are desired to state what the teachings of the Scriptures are on this subject. The question is one of great moment, and is easily answered; as the supposition that the Word divested himself of his divine attributes or withheld himself from exerting them on his becoming incarnate in Jesus, is not only without authority from the Bible and contradictious to his nature, but is against the explicit representations of the gospels, epistles, and ancient prophets, and would, if legitimate, overthrow the work of redemption.

The great change that took place in the incarnation of the eternal Word, did not consist at all in, or involve a relinquishment of his divine attributes. That was impossible. He is from his nature, as a self-existence, unhangeable. He could not divest himself of his infinitude, his omniscience, his omnipotence, his omnipresence. It would imply that he sunk into absolute unconsciousness, and that his union to the man Jesus was, on his part, wholly involuntary and unknown, and therefore without effect; and that would imply, that his deity was a disqualification for his participating actively in that part of the work of redemption which he accomplished in his life and death.

But admitting that he cannot have divested himself, or been divested of his divine attributes, but entered into union with Jesus in a full possession and consciousness of them, it is still asked, May it not yet be that in that union, he withheld himself from the exertion of his attributes and a direct participation in the acts of Jesus; so that those acts were the acts of Christ's human nature; and consequently that the miracles wrought in attestation of his doctrines were the work of the Father, and the messages he delivered from God the inspirations of the Holy Spirit, in the same manner as the messages and miracles of the prophets and apostles were the work of God, not in any measure of their own powers? We answer, No. The supposition is as contradictious as the other to his nature, the ends for which he became incarnate, and the teachings of the sacred word. What was the object of the incarnation of the Word, if he took no part in the acts of Christ in his official work? What virtue did his obedience and sufferings derive from the presence of the divine nature, if it was wholly dissociated from them? But the participation of the divine nature in all that was done by, and all that befell Christ in his life, ministry, and death, is expressly and fully affirmed in the Scriptures, and exhibited as giving to his obedience and death the infinite significance and worth by which they are made the ground of pardon and acceptance to those whom he redeems.

The change to which the eternal Word condescended in becoming incarnate, was not a change of nature, or suspension of attributes; but a change of station, relation, and the

mode in which he manifested himself. He descended from the station of Jehovah, the self-existent, the creator, upholder, possessor, and ruler of all, and took the station of a subject of God. He exchanged the form of glory in which he had before revealed himself to creatures, that belongs to his nature —and assumed the form of a servant, the likeness of men; and thenceforward manifested himself in that to men and angels, and exerted his divine attributes in the acts of the complex person, Christ Jesus, so that those acts were as absolutely the acts of the divine as they were of the human nature. This is taught with the utmost explicitness in the following passage.

"Let the mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who being in the form of God, regarded not that equality with God as eagerly to be grasped (retained), but emptied (divested) himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and being found (manifested) in shape (guise, outward semblance) as man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, death indeed on a cross. Wherefore also God exalted him, and gave him a name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of heavenly beings and of earthly, and of subearthly, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Philip. ii. 5–11.

The being who is here declared to be in the form of God, and in equality with him, is the eternal Word, considered anterior to his incarnation, not the complex person Jehovah Jesus; for it is affirmed that he emptied (divested) himself (of that form) "taking the form of a servant, and being made in the likeness of men," which are predicated only of him who assumed the form of a servant, not of the servant whose form he assumed. It is of the pre-existing divine Word therefore exclusively that those affirmations are made. Yet that identical being who was in the form of God, and equal with him, and who took on himself the form of a servant (subject), it is next declared—"being found (manifested) in figure (fashion, guise) as man, became obedient unto death, death even on a cross." The obedience of the complex person, Christ Jesus, unto his death, is thus predicated absolutely of the eternal word incarnate in Jesus. Having taken the station and form of a subject of God by union with a man,

he rendered obedience in that station and form, both to the laws that were imposed on him in common with men, and to the higher and peculiar laws to which he subjected himself because of the work of redemption he came to accomplish. And that obedience comprised all the acts of Christ Jesus from the beginning of his life to his death—all his acts toward God, of worship, love, submission, trust, humbleness, devotedness, fidelity, steadfastness, labor; and all his acts toward men of pity, sympathy, love, tenderness, patience, longsuffering, self-denial, teaching, warning, rebuke, authority, working miracles, correcting errors; and all his acts in resisting temptation, triumphing over Satan, enduring false accusations, insult, mockery, outrage, and at length death for the sins of the world;—all, all from the first emotion that rose in the breast of Jesus, to the last pang in which he expired on Calvary, was done and borne by the eternal Word, in obedience to the Father, in the station and form of a servant he had assumed in order to the redemption of the world. The power by which those acts were put forth, was accordingly the power of the Almighty Word; the intelligence that was exerted in them, was his boundless intelligence, the rectitude, the love, the purity, the meekness, the gentleness, the benignity, that characterized them, were his gratitude and love, the movements and expressions of his infinite heart. The acts of his obedience had accordingly all the virtue, significance, and grandeur of divine acts, and were literally therefore the righteousness of God.

This truth is taught also Hebrews v. 8, and ii. 8–18: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience from the things he suffered, and being perfected, became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." "But him who was made a little lower than angels, that he might taste death for every man, we see, (namely) Jesus, crowned with glory and honor on account of the suffering of death. For it became him for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, bringing many sons to glory, to perfect the Leader of their salvation through sufferings. For both the Sanctifier and the sanctified are all of one [nature]. For which reason he is not ashamed to call them brethren. Since then the children have partaken of blood and flesh, he himself also in like manner partook of them, that through

death he might bring to naught him who has the power of death, that is the devil, and might deliver them who, through fear of death, were through all their life subjects of bondage. For verily he laid not hold of angels (to help them) but he laid hold of the seed of Abraham. Whence it behoved him in all things to be like the brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, in order to expiate the sins of the people: For having himself been tempted in that which he suffered, he is able to succor those who are tempted." Subjection to trial, and suffering, and obedience in them, are thus with equal explicitness here affirmed of the Son, who became a partaker of blood and flesh that he might be of the same nature as those whom he came to redeem; and are declared to have been essential in order to his becoming the author of salvation to them who obey him. Unless he had yielded precisely such an obedience as that which he rendered, uninterrupted, spotless, perfect, comprising the greatest possible acts of humiliation, subjection to authority, self-denial, resistance to temptation, submission to injury and malice from men, patience, pity, forbearance, and love, under dishonor and suffering, from them, and steadfastness even under the hidings of the Father's face; and forming therefore the most indubitable and absolute proof that is possible of unalterable allegiance to him, he could not have filled his office as high priest, because neither his obedience nor expiation would have had the perfection that were requisite to their acceptance by the Father as the ground of the pardon and justification of men.

That the change to which the Word submitted in becoming incarnate, was thus a change of station and relations, and the assumption thereby of the obligations of that station —not a change of nature, or suspension of attributes, is clearly taught also by Christ himself, who asserted, during his life in the world, his oneness and equality with the Father, and his possession and exercise of the same divine attributes and prerogatives. "I and the Father are one." "I am the Son of God." "The Father is in me and I in him." "My Father worketh hitherto [on the Sabbath] and I work." "The Son can do nothing of himself [adversely to, or independently of the Father] but what he seeth the

Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them to life—even so the Son quickeneth to life whom he will." "The hour is coming *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." It was thus he, by his own intelligence and power, who at Nain recalled the widow's son to life, and raised Lazarus from the grave; he who stilled the tempest; who created wine and bread, who cast out demons, who gave health to the sick and sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb: and accordingly in his message to John the Baptist, he presented these miracles as proofs that he was the Messiah, not an ordinary prophet, not simply because it was foreshown that the Messiah was to perform them, Isaiah xlii. 1–7; but pre-eminently because he wrought them himself; for the representation there, as everywhere else in the gospels, is, that *he* himself wrought them; not as in respect to the miracles that were wrought in attestation of the apostles, that they were wrought by divine power through their hands. "In that same hour *he* cured many of infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits; and unto many blind *he* gave sight. Then Jesus said unto them, go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and to the poor the gospel is preached." It was thus he who performed those works of infinite power, intelligence, and love; and unless they had been the work of his own attributes, they would not have been proofs that he was the Messiah, inasmuch as similar miracles were wrought in connexion with the ministry of the apostles who were mere men.

The temptations also addressed to him in the wilderness by Satan, proceeded on the fact that, if he were the Messiah he must be all-mighty, all-intelligent, and of absolute dominion over the material world. "If thou be the Son of God, speak that these stones should become bread;"—assuming that if he were the Son of God, he could by a word cause that change in their nature. Christ did not reply by indicating that in becoming incarnate he had divested himself

of his divine attributes, or suspended their exertion; but by stating that having taken the form and station of a human subject, it behoved him to obey the law under which he was placed, and though almighty, to submit to the self-denials to which he was called, as a test of his allegiance. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." That is, as is seen from the original, Deut. viii. 8, Man shall not live by bread only, but if that fails, as it failed the Israelites in the wilderness—by whatever other food God is pleased in his sovereignty to provide;—as for them he provided manna. Had Christ wrought a miracle to supply his wants, it would have been a refusal to wait for the Father to make provision for him, and thence a refusal to submit to the trial of his allegiance to which he was subjected, and so an act of disobedience. His withholding himself from a miraculous supply of his wants and submission to the self-denial of a forty days' fast, was an act therefore in which his almighty power, his infinite intelligence, his perfect rectitude, and his immeasurable love were as absolutely exerted, as his omnipotence, knowledge, and sovereignty could have been, had he wrought the miracle to which Satan aimed to excite him.

And in harmony with his possession and exercise of his divine attributes during his life in the world, he prayed as he was about to pass out of it, not that he might regain the possession or resume the exercise of them, but simply that he might resume the external glory which he had with the Father before the world was. "Now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," which was not the glory of attributes or dominion, but the glory of manifestation that belongs to his nature as divine, but of which he had divested himself in taking on himself the form of a servant and the likeness of men.

And finally, that all the acts of Christ in his work on earth were the acts of his divine as well as his human nature, is certain from the consideration that, had they not been, neither his obedience nor his death could have been an adequate ground for the pardon and justification of men. In order to his filling the office of the second Adam, whose

life and death should form a proper ground for the recovery of men from the dominion and curse of sin, it was necessary not only that his obedience should be absolute, and rendered in conditions of such difficulty as that it should be an indubitable proof of inflexible allegiance, but that it should have a greatness, an energy, and a glory immeasurably beyond what it could derive from the powers of a mere creature. Had the righteousness he exercised been the work simply of his human faculties, it would have simply been commensurate with his obligations as a man, and adequate only to his own justification. It could not have been a fit ground for the pardon and acceptance of sinners, and especially of the infinite millions who are to be justified through him. In order to that, an obedience and expiation are requisite that transcend the limits of a finite nature, and that are wrought, therefore, by one who is not by nature finite and under law, but instead, is infinite, and the law-giver himself, who, therefore, voluntarily assumes the place of a subject, and gratuitously, as a substitute for those whose redemption he undertakes, accomplishes an obedience and expiation that are commensurate with the attributes and rights of God. And such were the life and death of Christ Jesus. His acts being the acts of his divine as well as his human nature, had all the greatness, energy, and resplendence of Divine acts, and constitute a righteousness that is infinite and divine.

This great feature of the Saviour's work was thus essential to its perfection; and an understanding of it is requisite to an intelligent faith in him, and realization of the perfection and grandeur of the justification they meet who obtain redemption through him. The acceptance and adjudgment to eternal life of unfallen beings, who, when arraigned at the tribunal of God, are found to have rendered an obedience that is perfect, is eminently beautiful; yet their righteousness—spotless and resplendent as it is—is only commensurate with their limited natures; but the righteousness of Christ, by which those whom he redeems are justified, is not limited to the scope of their faculties, but has the infinitude and grandeur of the attributes and acts of the Word, and is the righteousness of God. In that the sinner, however guilty, finds a justification suited to his necessities, and

appropriate to the heirship of the eternal life in Christ's kingdom, to which it is to entitle him.

II. THE DESOLATION OF EDOM.

A correspondent asks how the perpetual desolation of Idumea, foreshown Isaiah xxxiv., as interpreted in the Journal, No. xxxi., is reconcilable with the new creation of the earth and heaven, predicted Isaiah lxv. and lxvi; 2 Peter iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1.

"Nothing that has yet occurred answers to the prophecy: You say its accomplishment is yet future and is to take place at the coming of our Lord. But how can that be? He is to destroy his enemies; but is he not to restore the earth to fruitfulness and beauty, to subdue the ferocity of wild beasts, to give to Israel the whole territory from the river of Egypt to the Euphrates? How then, after that time, is this land to be empty, desolate, abominable, impassable for ever? I am at a loss how to interpret the prophecy. If taken literally, its accomplishment must undoubtedly be yet future; but how can Idumea be consigned to perpetual desolation if the earth is new created?"

We answer: We suppose both are to be literally interpreted, and are consistent with each other; that Edom is to be doomed to the desolation that is foretold of it, as a monument of God's avenging justice; the more impressive from the contrast it will present to all other parts of the world; and that the earth at large will be created anew, and raised to a luxuriance and beauty equalling, and perhaps transcending that with which it was originally adorned. The following is the prophecy.

"Come near ye nations to hear, and ye people hearken. Let the earth hear and its fulness; the world and all that comes forth of it. For there is anger to Jehovah against all nations, and wrath against all their hosts. He has doomed them, he has given them to the slaughter and their slain shall be cast out; and their corpses—their stench shall go up, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. And all the host of heaven shall consume away, and the heavens shall be rolled up as a scroll, and all their hosts shall fade, like the fading leaf from the vine, and like a with-

ered fig from a fig-tree. For my sword in the heaven reeks; behold upon Edom it shall come down; and upon the people of my curse for judgment. A sword is to Jehovah; it is full of blood; it is smeared with fat; with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams. For there is to Jehovah a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Edom. And unicorns shall fall down with them, and bullocks with bulls. And their land shall be soaked with blood; and their land made fat with fatness. For it is a day of vengeance to Jehovah; a year of recompenses for the cause of Zion."

The hosts that are to be slain are thus the hosts, not of Idumea, but of the nations; their slaughter is to be because of their war upon Zion; and it is to be accomplished by means that will also destroy all their animals, whether they are such as are used in battle, like the horse, or flocks and herds that are designed for their food; and this shows that the occasion is to be that of the gathering of the Antichristian armies against Jerusalem for the purpose of dispersing the Israelites who will have re-established themselves there, when Christ is to descend and destroy the hostile hosts and their animals with fire, Zech. xiv. 1–15. That the destruction is to be by fire is indicated in the verses that follow.

"And her streams [Edom's] shall be turned to pitch, and her dust to brimstone, and her land shall become burning pitch. Day and night it shall not be quenched; for ever shall its smoke go up, from generation to generation shall it lie waste. There shall be no one passing through it for ever and ever. There shall possess it (as a heritage) the pelican and porcupine. The crane and crow shall dwell in it. And he shall stretch upon it the line of confusion and stones of emptiness. As to her nobles, there shall be none whom they shall call to the kingdom, and all her princes shall be nothing. And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in her fortresses; and she shall be a home for wolves, a court for ostriches. The wild creatures of the desert shall meet with howling creatures. And the shaggy monster shall call to his fellow. Only the night monster reposes there and finds for herself a resting place. There shall the great owl make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shadow; and there shall the vultures also

be gathered, every one with his mate. Seek ye out of the book of Jehovah and read. No one of them is wanting; no one lacks another (a mate). For my mouth it has commanded, and his Spirit it has gathered them, and he has cast the lot for them, and his hand has divided it to them by line. They shall possess it for ever; to all generations shall they dwell therein."

As the conversion of Edom into pitch and brimstone is thus exhibited as the consequence of the vengeance by which the armies of the nations are destroyed, it is clear that the sword of Jehovah in the sky, by which they are to be slain, is the fire of vengeance which he is to shower on them from the atmosphere, and that it is by that that the land is to be converted to a perpetual waste.

Nothing can be more unquestionable then, than that this prophecy foreshows that a vast host of the nations who are arrayed against Zion are to be destroyed in Idumea by the direct interposition of the Almighty, raining on them a storm of fire and brimstone; and that the region is to continue to burn at one point at least for ever, and is generally to remain a wild and dreary waste.

No language could assert those great futurities in forms more unequivocal, and preclusive of every other sense. This construction, moreover, is confirmed by a parallel prediction, Isaiah lxvi. 21–24, which expressly represents the burning as subsequent to the creation of the new heavens and new earth, and to continue for ever. After predicting that "The Lord will come with fire and with his chariots, like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire;—for by fire and his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh, and the slain of the Lord shall be many"—and foreshowing that then he "will gather all nations and tongues, and they shall come and see his glory," and he will recall the Israelites out of all lands, and re-establish them in their land, and "take of them for priests and Levites;"—it is added: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I am making, are standing before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name stand. And it shall come to pass from new moon to new moon, and from sabbath to sabbath, all flesh shall come to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they shall go forth and gaze upon the

carcasses of the men who revolted from me, for their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched; and they shall be a horror to all flesh." Thus after the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, and the conversion of the nations, the scene where the hostile hosts will have been destroyed by Christ's avenging fires is still to burn, and the carcasses of the slain, rendered imperishable, are to remain unburned, and form a spectacle which all flesh shall go forth and gaze upon with horror at their doom, and recognition doubtless of its righteousness and wisdom, and gratitude for the grace that has rescued them from a similar lot. That awful monument of the anger of God at the great enemies who are to attempt to wrest the sceptre of the world from his hands, is thus to be erected for a moral end, and has its solution in the awe of the justice of God, and horror at the guilt and doom of rebellion which it is to excite. That there is to be a moral necessity that Christ should at that crisis interpose in person, and with his own hand destroy the apostate hosts who are to be leagued against him, in forms so terrible as to strike the surviving race and the whole universe with the deepest fear, we thus are taught by the purpose he has revealed of coming in power and glory, with his angels, and in flaming fire, taking vengeance in these shapes on them who acknowledged him not, and consigning them to everlasting perdition; and a like necessity we must infer from the prophecy is also to exist, that the scene of that catastrophe should be continued unaltered, that it may impress the successive generations of the race through the round of endless ages, with profounder realizations of what man was when left under the power of his passions and of Satan, and with a deeper horror of sin and its doom, than they would otherwise reach.

There is a similar prediction also in Rev. xiv. 9–11, where it is foreshown, that those who, after the fall of Babylon the great, continue in apostasy, shall be tormented in fire and brimstone, whose smoke shall ascend for ever and ever. After the angel who proclaimed the fall of Babylon, "a third angel followed, saying, with a loud voice, If any one worship the wild beast and its image, and receive a mark on his forehead or on his hand, he shall even drink of the wine of the wrath of God poured an unmixed wine into the

cup of his indignation, and shall be tormented in fire and brimstone before the holy angels, and before the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth for ever and ever. And they have no rest day and night who worship the wild beast and its image, and whoever receives the mark of its name." In like manner, also, Rev. xix. 19, 20: "And I saw the wild beast and the kings of the earth and their armies, gathered together to make war with him who sat on the white horse, and his army. And the wild beast was taken, and the false prophet with it, who wrought wonders before it, with which he deceived those who received the mark of the wild beast, and those who worshipped its image. And they two were cast alive into the lake of fire which burns with brimstone." Here the destruction of those denoted by the wild beast and the false prophet by fire and brimstone, is like that threatened in the former passage, of those who worship them; and the ascending of the smoke of their burning (which is, doubtless, to be common to them), in the presence of the angels and of the Lamb, who having come in his glory with the angels, will have received the earth as his kingdom, and commenced his reign for ever and ever, indicates that the scene of their destruction will continue to burn, and be visible to men.

That the burning is to be volcanic, and may naturally continue endlessly, is shown by the pitch and brimstone which are to be thrown on Idumea, and are known from the Vale of Sodom, to be treasured in that region; and is indicated also by the earthquakes—which are the effects of volcanic forces—that are to take place at Christ's appearing, Isaiah ii. 19-21; Zech. xiv. 4-10.

And finally, that these terrible methods of destruction are to be chosen by the Most High for the convictions and impressions they are to make on the nations, is explicitly taught in the parallel prediction, Ezekiel xxxviii. and xxxix. where it is foreshown that a great earthquake is then to shake the land of Israel, xxxviii. 19, 20, and that a large part of the hostile host is to be destroyed on the east of the Dead Sea (xxxix. 11), on their way, perhaps, from Egypt, by Suez and Akabah (vs. 5), or stationed there, and south in Idumea, to intercept the Israelites from flight. "I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many

people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hail-stones, fire and brimstone. Thus will I magnify myself and sanctify myself, and I will be known in the eyes of many nations, and they shall know that I am the Lord." "So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel; and I will not let them pollute my holy name any more; and the heathen shall know that I am the Jehovah, the Holy One in Israel." "And I will set my glory among the heathen, and the heathen shall see my judgment that I have executed, and my hand that I have laid upon them," xxxviii. 22, 23, xxxix. 7–21. As these terrible displays of his presence, his wrath to his enemies, and his mercy to his people, are to be necessary to impress the nations with just views of his being, his power, his holiness, his justice, his truth, and his grace to those whom he has chosen as his children; so the fearful spectacle which the burning pit, whence the fires of his vengeance burst upon his enemies, strewn with unconsuming carcasses of the apostatés, is to present, is, doubtless, in like manner to make known his holiness and justice in a visible and resistless form to the generations who are thereafter, from age to age, to come into existence.

And this is in harmony with the still larger view implied in these, and directly presented in many other passages, that a leading aim of the administration God has hitherto exercised over the world, is to let it be seen what the character is that fallen creatures naturally assume, and what his rights are over them; that sin is permitted on so vast a scale and in such forms, and through such a series of ages, in order, by that infinite demonstration of man's hopeless alienation, to prepare the way for the salvation of the whole race from generation to generation after Christ's coming, with the clearest intelligence and fullest realization in every subject of his empire, of the ruin from which they are redeemed, and ascription of their new creation, deliverance from the curse of sin, and acceptance and blessedness in his kingdom, to his power, and wisdom, and love, which confer them. It is to be the closing act thus of those stupendous preparatives for the ages of unmixed love and grace that are to follow, that the awful monuments foreshown in these prophecies of God's wrath, and the guilt and doom of apostates, are to be reared, and

set for ever in the gaze of the race. They are continually to keep the past in their minds, show them the horrible ruin from which they have been rescued, strike them with awe of the rights and the justice of God, inspire them with gratitude and love, and bind them thereby in unfaltering allegiance to his throne.

Art. VII.—Literary and Critical Notices.

1. The Crucifixion of Christ. By Daniel H. Hill, Superintendent of the North Carolina Military Institute, and late Brevet-Major in the United States Army. Philadelphia: W. S. & A. Martien. 1859.

The author's aim is to point out the consistency of the narratives in the four gospels of the events from the close of the paschal supper to the delivery of Christ to Pilate; and present the proof which that harmony forms of their truthfulness. The Agony, Seizure, and Trial of Christ by the Jewish Priests and Rulers, is accordingly the proper title of the work, not the Crucifixion, which is not in any measure its theme. The histories by the evangelists are not copies of each other. Each formed his recital of those events, independently of the others, and each relates incidents, or adds strokes in his description of them that are omitted by the others. Yet those separate incidents and fuller delineations, instead of contradicting in any degree, only supplement each other, and taken together form a consistent whole, the truth of which is more indubitable and conspicuous from the corroboration the witnesses yield each other, than it would be had each narrative embraced all, and presented it with exactly the same outline and hue, as the others. This supplementing and confirmation of each other is unfolded by Major Hill in many cases with much ingenuity and power, and will interest and instruct readers generally. The theme, however, will be probably felt by most to demand a more calm and elevated treatment, and terms and expressions especially like many he employs—drawn, perhaps, from the camp—to be wholly unsuitable in theological discussions.

2. A Grammar of the New Testament Diction; intended as an introduction to the critical study of the Greek New Testament. By Dr. George B. Winer, translated from the sixth

enlarged and improved edition of the original, by Edward Masson, M.A., formerly Professor in the University of Athens. Vol. ii. Philadelphia: Smith & English; New York: R. Carter & Brothers; Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

THIS volume treats of the particles and the structure of sentences, and completes the work. It is a special merit of this edition—which is in every way tasteful—that the type, both Greek and English, is of suitable size and properly spaced. The high rank the work has long held renders commendation unnecessary. No student of the Greek New Testament should fail to avail himself of its assistance.

3. THE PENTATEUCH AND THE BOOK OF JOSHUA, with an Original and Copious Critical and Explanatory Commentary. By the Rev. Robert Jamieson, D.D., Minister of St. Paul's Parish, Glasgow. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien. 1859.

THE text, with references, occupies the left hand page, and the comment, in a fine, but clear type, the right. Though brief, it furnishes the chief facts and presents the important explanations that are requisite to the reader's understanding the narratives, covenants, laws, and institutes of those ancient Books.

4. LIFE'S MORNING: or Counsels and Encouragements for Youthful Believers. By the author of Life's Evening, etc. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1860.

THIS is a delightful volume of cautions and encouragements drawn from the Sacred Word, and the example of believers, to aid the young who have just entered on the Christian life, amidst the difficulties that attend their first experience, and lead them to an intelligent, resolute, and joyous consecration of themselves to the service of Christ.

5. JESUS ONLY. By J. Oswald Jackson. Philadelphia; W. S. & A Martien. 1860.

A SERIES of stirring announcements, warnings, and exhortations to the impenitent to rouse them to a sense of their sin and ruin, and prompt them to look unto Christ for salvation.

6. Parochial Lectures on the Psalms. By the late Rev. Daniel Caldwell, A.M. Psalm 1–50. Philadelphia: W. S. & A. Martien. 1859.

These lectures, practical rather than exegetical, presenting and enforcing the great truths of the Psalms, and unfolding the various forms of affection that are expressed in them, are well suited to aid the thoughts and devotions of the reader, and deserve a wide circulation. Mr. Caldwell entered with interest into his themes, felt the power and preciousness of the divine word, and drew the hues, in a measure, with which his lectures are tinged, from his own deep experience of the reality and glory of the great things of redemption.

7. An Address on the Life and Character of Parker Cleveland, LL.D. By Leonard Woods, D.D. Portland: Brown Thurston. 1859.

An elegant tribute to the genius, learning, usefulness, and worth of Professor Cleveland, who filled the office of Lecturer on Chemistry, Mineralogy, Geology, and other branches of natural science, for fifty years, in Bowdoin College, Maine, with extraordinary ability and success. His power as a teacher, from his strong sense, his originality, his mastery of his theme, his enthusiasm, and his frank and generous spirit seems to have been unrivalled. It was a mark of his clear-headedness, comprehension of his principles, and prudence, that he was never betrayed by great names, and its popularity, into acquiescence in the theories of the changes through which the exterior of our planet has passed, which exhibit it as having existed through myriads and millions of ages; but held that its date is that ascribed to it in the inspired history of its creation, taken in its natural sense, and that all the facts of science are in harmony with that narrative.

The portraiture of his intellect, his manners, and his life, is very happily drawn. The strokes are so natural and full, that the reader feels as though the original had been the object of his personal knowledge, and shares in the respect and admiration with which the author of the Address is animated.

8. The Great Tribulation; or Things Coming on the Earth. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., F.R.S.E., Minister of the Scottish National Church, Crown Court, Covent Garden. First Series. New York: Rudd & Carleton. 1860.

These Lectures, though earnest, and presenting many just and impressive thoughts, seem the work of haste, and, in a measure, of carelessness, rather than study and taste; and descend, at times, to topics drawn from political journals, that are unsuitable to the pulpit. They are marked, however, by a higher measure of prudence than some of the author's publications during the Crimean war; though he continues to hold that the great catastrophe of the Catholic nations began in the revolution of 1848, and is soon to reach its consummation; but that England is to escape, and be signalized, because of her Protestantism, by tokens of God's favor as conspicuous as the judgments are to be with which the nations who follow in the train of Babylon are to be overwhelmed. That great changes are impending; that a brief period may witness momentous modifications of the civil governments of the Continent, and an important diminution, and perhaps overthrow, of the Pope's political power, and possibly the dawn of a new and brighter age, has undoubtedly become more generally the conviction of writers of all classes, than at any former period.

9. The Revival in Ireland. Letters from Ministers and Medical Men in Ulster on the Revival of Religion in the North of Ireland, addressed to the Rev. H. G. Guinness. Philadelphia: W. S. & A. Martien. 1860.

These Letters, which appear to have been written to Mr. Guinness since he reached this country, present a clearer, fuller, and more impressive account than we have elsewhere seen of the Revival in Ireland, and not only leave no room to doubt that it is a genuine work of the Spirit, but show that it is one of the most indubitable and glorious that has signalized the age. It was preceded by great fruitlessness and lifelessness in many of the churches where it has assumed the most striking forms; it has been the work most conspicuously of the immediate power of the Holy Spirit, independently of human instrumentality, and teaches in that respect a lesson of which the people of God had never greater need to be reminded; it has been charac-

terized by deep convictions of sin; and the faith of those who have obtained hope is placed, in the most distinct and emphatic forms, on the blood and righteousness of Christ, and is exemplified in a holy life. "The physical manifestations," or bursts of anguish, alarm, and terror with which many have been so overwhelmed as to fall, have not been—as far as can be judged—the effect of nervous excitement or enthusiasm, but the result of disclosures by the Spirit of their guilt and ruin, so sudden, vivid, and terrific, as, like a thunderbolt, to crush them to the earth. The insupportable sense with which they were smitten of their sinfulness and exposure to divine wrath has, accordingly, generally in a few hours, issued in submission to the Saviour, and a joyous trust and hope in Him. May God visit every part of his church with these wondrous displays of the resistlessness of his power, his sovereignty, and his love.

10. The Death of Washington Irving. A Discourse delivered in the Second Reformed Dutch Church of Tarrytown, by the Pastor, Rev. John A. Todd.

A tribute of affection and respect, in which the eminent talents and labors of Mr. Irving are commemorated, and the social and domestic virtues drawn, which made him the object of love and veneration to those universally in the wide circle of neighbors and friends among whom he passed the evening of his days.

11. The Historical Books of the Holy Scriptures:—Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther; with a Critical and Explanatory Commentary. By the Rev. Robert Jamieson, D.D., Glasgow, Scotland. Philadelphia: W. S. & A. Martien. 1860.

This volume is to the Historical Books, what that noticed on a preceding page is to the Pentateuch and Joshua. It is excellently adapted to the use of the young especially, and general readers, who do not look for philological details, but only for such facts and explanations as will enable them to distinguish the scenes, comprehend the characters, and understand the events that are presented in the sacred narratives.

12. Popular Geology. A Series of Lectures read before the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh; with Descriptive

Sketches from a Geologist's Portfolio. By Hugh Miller, with an introductory Résumé of the Progress of Geological Science by Mrs. Miller. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

These lectures, though not before published, present little that is novel or of interest. They are confined to their proper theme, Geology, and are marked by his fine powers of description and illustration, while tinged with the enthusiasm and disposition to exaggerate the significance of his subject, that finally issued in the wreck of his intellect. Were he as sound as a speculatist as he is vivacious as a writer, his rank would deservedly be high.

13. Blind Bartimeus; or, the Story of the Sightless Sinner and the Great Physician. By Rev. William J. Hoge, D.D. Fifth Edition. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

This is a happy example of the use of the analogy that subsists between natural and spiritual things, to exemplify and enforce the truths of the gospel. The author employs the parallelism the blindness, helplessness, and misery of Bartimeus bear to

parables. He treats them as simple likenesses, or parallels in dissimilar spheres, and employs them only to throw a stronger light on that which he wishes to exemplify and enforce;—an office wholly unlike that of types, which Dr. Fairbairn assigns to like historical personages and events of the Old Testament. Bartimeus was not a type of "sightless sinners," either in his blindness, his cry for sight, or his reception of it from Christ. Were he a type in the first relation, it would follow that he is in the others also; and thence that *all* who are spiritually blind, apply to Christ for spiritual illumination, and receive the gift from him. But that is as mistaken and groundless, as it would be to assume that Bartimeus was a type of all persons who are literally blind; and thence infer that all who are literally blind, apply to Christ for natural sight, and receive it, as Bartimeus did. Nor were Christ's cures of the defective and diseased bodies of men, his deliverance of them from possession by demons, and his restoration of them from death, types of the cure of their souls of analogous spiritual evils. For that would imply that the bodies of the redeemed are to have no share in the redemption Christ is to confer on those whom he ransoms. If they were types of any part of redemption, they surely would be types of the restoration of the *bodies* of the holy from the blight and curse of sin to a perfect and immortal life. But they filled no such office, and had no adaptation to it. They exemplified the power and wisdom and grace by which Christ will raise the dead in spiritual and glorious forms to an endless life; they presented a striking analogy to the change he works in the mind when he new creates it by his Spirit; but they are not types of either.

The volume is written with great directness and warmth, and is especially adapted, by its earnestness and copiousness and grace of illustration, to interest and impress the young.

14. Lectures on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians. By John Lillie, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church. Kingston, N. Y. New York. R. Carter & Brothers. 1860.

Dr. Lillie is the author, our readers will recollect, of the Translation of these Epistles, with copious references to versions by other writers, and critical remarks, noticed in the Journal of July 1856. Familiar with the Greek text, and the expositions it has received, he is eminently qualified to present its teachings, as is his aim in this volume, in a form adapted at once to the

uses of the learned and of general readers. The Lectures are marked by ample scholarship, sound judgment, simplicity, force, and warmth, and present with success the practical as well as the doctrinal features of the Epistles. While he treats of the whole text, he dwells mainly on the passages that are of chief importance, and with brevity and point; indulging in no perplexing disquisitions, nor encumbering his pages with wearying details. His expositions of the prophetic parts of the Epistles are of special ability and interest. We have seen no view of the great prediction, 2 Thess. ii. 1–12, of higher discrimination, good sense, self-evidence, and adaptation to command the assent of impartial readers, than his. He presents also with truthfulness and power, the great peculiarities of Paul's intellect and heart, as they are disclosed in the letters; and the errors, weaknesses, conflicts, dangers, on the one side, and joyous faith, unyielding steadfastness, and glowing love on the other, of the Thessalonian believers, as they are sketched by the apostle. The work will meet, we hope, a large acceptance from the churches, and be followed by others on other portions of the New Testament, which, as is generally known, Dr. Lillie has made the subject of minute critical study.

15. The British Periodicals. Republished by L. Scott & Co.

These Reviews for the winter present more than an ordinary share of attractions. The London, Edinburgh, and North British especially have articles of unusual ability.

16. Catalogue of the Library of Prof. W. W. Turner. To be sold May 28, by Bangs, Merwin & Co., 594 & 596 Broadway.

It has not been our habit to notice sales of libraries, but we cannot refrain from calling the attention of our readers to the present Catalogue. Mr. Turner was a scholar of large attainments. His industry was unflagging; his judgment keen and discriminating; his mind single to the truth. The Catalogue now before us exhibits a very rare collection of works in the Oriental languages and on Philology; and aside from its specific use for the immediate occasion, we would advise its preservation by those engaged in similar studies, as a guide in the formation of their own libraries.

INDEX.

A.

Acts of the Divine Nature in Christ, 677.
Adams, N., Great Concern, 341.
Advent, Christ's Second, 588.
Annals of the American Pulpit, Sprague's, 151.
Answers to Correspondents, 677.
Ashton's Mothers of the Bible, 343.
Authority of the Bible—Carleton, 632.

B.

Barnes, Rev. A., Review of his Foundation of Faith in God's word, 632.
Berg, Dr. J. F., on Christ's Second Advent, 588.
British Periodicals, 351, 698.

C.

Caldwell on the Psalms, 693.
Carleton, H., Authority of the Bible, 632.
Christ's Coming and Reign, 293. Promises in the Epistles to the Seven Churches, 406.
Cleveland, Parker, Life and Character, 693.
Consistency of Genesis and Geology, 133.
Correspondents, Answers to, 677.
Cumming's, Dr. J., Great Tribulation, 694.

E.

Edom, Desolation of, 605.
Eschatology, Lee's, 177.
Exposition of Acts, 120.

F.

Facts of Geology consistent with Genesis, 133.
Fairbairn's, Dr. P., Hermeneutical Manual, 338. Typology, 529.
Figures of Isaiah, 153, 318, 438, 663.
Foot's Sketches of Virginia, 342.
Forsyth, Dr. J., on Indo-Syrian Church, 420.

G.

Geological Change caused by the Deluge, 263.
God is Love, 571.

H.

Hamilton's, Sir W., Lectures on Metaphysics, 349.
Harris's, Dr. J., Theory of Conversion of the World, 1.
Hequembourg's Plan of Creation, 477.
Hill's Crucifixion of Christ, 691.
Hoge's, Dr. W. J., Blind Bartimeus, 696.

Lee's Eschatology, 177.
Life's Morning, 692.
Lillie's, Dr. J., Lectures on Thessaloni
Literary and Critical Notices, 337, 69

M

Mansel's Limits of Thought, 353.
Masson's Life of Milton, 347.
McLaren, Dr. D. C., Consistency of Geo
of Geological change, 263.
Miller, Hugh, Popular Geology, 685.

N.

Newton's Lectures on Daniel, 340.
Notes on Scripture, 37, 219, 372.

O.

Old South Chapel Prayer Meeting, 349.

P.

Pond, Dr. E., on Judges, 468. On God

R.

Regeneration, 93.
Revival in Ireland, 694.

S.

Sprague, Dr. W. B., Annals of American

T.

Tyler, Dr. B.